

# METHODIST REVIEW

---

MAY, 1912

---

## ART I.—BISHOP SPELLMEYER

MATTHIAS HENRY SPELLMEYER, the father of the subject of this sketch, was born in a small village in Germany and came to this country in his early manhood. Here he met Miss Mary Jamison, who was born on one of the Shetland Islands, off the coast of Scotland. The two were united in marriage on the 16th day of January, 1847. To them three children were born, one of whom died many years ago. Of the others, Henry was the elder, and Agnes, the wife of the Reverend Charles H. Jones, the younger. Considering his German-Scotch blood, it requires no great stretch of the imagination to account for some of the sterling qualities of Bishop Spellmeyer.

The character of Henry Spellmeyer was beautiful from childhood. In his retiring modesty, however, it was not easy for him to be persuaded that his calling could be to the holy ministry. He was but nine years old when his mother told her pastor that it was her daily practice to retire with him to her room and pray that he might grow up to be a good minister of Jesus Christ. Others also felt that such was his calling. Whatever might have been the convictions lurking in his own mind and heart, it required persuasion from those who had watched his development to lead him to believe that he would be able to meet such a responsibility. It was after his college graduation and while employed as a tutor in a private family that he consented to prepare a sermon which he would preach if opportunity occurred.

This cautiousness that characterized him at the beginning was with him in all his future work. He never undertook anything without special preparation. For his public utterances he did not depend upon the inspiration of the moment. This habit of mind brought to him a furnishing and equipment which served him to good purpose in his later ministry and particularly when he came to the episcopacy. He had a fund of well thought out material with which to stimulate and inspire a seemingly extemporaneous address. He was, however, no less careful in deeds than in speech. If he had a problem in administration to meet he gave it the most painstaking consideration, looking at it from every possible viewpoint. This would sometimes lead him to hesitation, but when he had thought through the matter, gathering all the light he could from all sources, he reached his decision and became immovable in his position. Hence he was strong in the administration of the affairs of pastorate or episcopacy.

His career was as remarkable for early development as for anything else. He was less than fifteen years of age when he entered the regular classical course in New York University and he was graduated with honors at the age of eighteen. And then, after having taken the course in the Union Theological Seminary, he was received on probation in the Newark Conference in March, 1869, being twenty-one years old. His first appointment was at Kingsley Church, Staten Island, within two miles of his father's home. He greatly endeared himself to the people of the charge, and was exceedingly successful in building up the church in all features of its growth. It was while in this pastorate, on November 8, 1871, that he was married at Haverstraw, N. Y., to Matilda M. W., daughter of the Rev. Thomas H. Smith, of the Newark Conference. After having served three full years at Kingsley he was stationed at Bloomfield, N. J., where a remarkable revival attended his ministry. At the end of his second year in Bloomfield one of the most prominent churches in the Conference appealed to the Bishop to have him sent to them, but the pressure from the charge he had been serving, accompanied by the need of his care for the many probationers he had received, prevailed with the Bishop against any change in his pastorate. Returning,

therefore, to his parish, and filling out the three years' term, he was met by appeals from three of the most important churches in the Conference insisting upon his appointment. This was in the spring of 1875, and the one succeeding in its efforts to secure his service was the Central Church of Newark. He was then twenty-seven years of age. To this church he gave the service of three full pastoral terms; two of these were under the three years' limit and the third one was under the five years' limit. The other churches which he served in an unbroken pastorate of thirty-five years in the Newark Conference were Saint James, Elizabeth; Trinity Church, Jersey City; Calvary Church, East Orange, and Roseville and Centenary Churches, Newark. In each case, while the time limit was on, he remained in the pastoral charge as long as the church would allow, and his whole itinerant ministry in the pastorate was confined to a territory that could be seen by the naked eye by anyone who could stand upon an eminence in the vicinity of either of his charges. There was scarcely a year in all this time when urgent efforts were not made to secure his transfer to large and responsible fields of labor outside of his Conference, but he was in love with his work where he best knew it and no tempting calls could swerve him from it. In each case he was so absorbed with the pastorate he was serving that men sometimes failed to appreciate the breadth of his sympathy; but his real vision did take in the broad area of the kingdom of Christ, and he had the greatest interest in other men's successes as well as his own.

He was possessed of very striking traits of a predominating manliness. His sense of justice was very keen and he applied it to all his affairs. Not willing to be imposed upon, he was even stronger in his purpose to not impose upon others; and while keenly feeling the infliction of a wrong he was ever ready to throw the mantle of charity upon those from whom offenses came. Nothing gave him more pleasure than to say a kind word or to do a kind act. Many men in the ministry—and laity as well—were made to feel his brotherly help in critical times. There was a phase of his life and character so tender and so sacred that one hesitates to intrude upon it by a single word of comment and yet it is difficult

to give a proper estimate of his qualities as a man without this mention. It was his lot to be overtaken with sore trial and to be overwhelmed with sorrow: of his four children, three beautiful boys were buried in childhood, the daughter has been a hopeless invalid for many years. His relation as son, as husband, as father, as brother would teach a valuable lesson if it were not too sacred for portrayal. A communication from his sister to the writer, received a few days after his death, contains the following extract: "He has been my idol all my life. As a small child I tried to follow him around, happy to be even near him. To me he has always been a wonderful brother. To him I always carried my burdens when they grew too heavy for me to carry alone. He has stood by me, ready to help and willing to comfort. He has been a brother such as no woman ever had before. All that seems real to me is the fact that I am in trouble and I want to tell my brother all about it again." That fine vein of sympathy and kindness that was so marked in his domestic relations was felt in all other associations in which he moved. Its manifestation in his pastoral work greatly endeared him to all to whom he ministered and was a decided factor in his marvelous success as a shepherd of souls.

Henry Spellmeyer was a very popular preacher. Multitudes gathered in crowded congregations to hear the Word. They were not attracted by sensational methods, for there were always the dignity and refinement about his pulpit ministrations that became the gospel of Christ. He never went to his task unprepared, nor with anything but a serious message to men. He had a remarkable discernment of the needs of the human heart, and his one purpose was to meet that necessity, in so far as he could, as an ambassador of Christ. Hence his sermons were characterized by deep spirituality. His expression was very clear. He seemed always able to say the right thing in the right way. No matter on what topic he spoke, there was no difficulty in immediately understanding his meaning. His voice was superior, and well trained, and his personal appearance in the pulpit or on the platform was very attractive. He never thought it necessary to be flippant in order to interest his hearers, or to clothe his thoughts



in the language of the street or to speak in slang phrases in order to make himself comprehended. The Rev. Dr. J. W. Lively, writing of the Gulf Conference over which Bishop Spellmeyer had presided, said, concerning him as a preacher, "He is a model of chasteness, clearness, and expression, while the matter is pure beaten oil. He is an elocutionist of a high cultured type, and this he brings into the pulpit with both grace and unction. His sermons would do to go to print without either erasure or addition, or change of a jot or tittle." One who labored as a fellow worker with him in the pastorate says, "We witnessed his goings forth among a people who saw in his busy footsteps the tracery of feet of mercy; we were cognizant of the steady grasp of his pulpit ministrations on vast congregations of edified hearers; we saw him in the Conference as a steady force interpenetrating all church interests. We knew him, when repeatedly smitten by grief, in a short time resignedly bowing to the will of God, nothing doubting; we enjoyed his personal friendship when among strange brethren, and we are prepared to say that we have never known a minister of Christ who more perfectly measured up to our ideal of a preacher, pastor, and all-round pyramidal man 'who stood four-square to every wind that blows.'"

While evidently considering the pulpit to be his throne, he was not of those who think themselves exempt from the exacting requirements of the details of pastoral attention. In this department of his work he was very systematic, careful, and persistent. He busied himself with the rounds of pastoral calls, going from house to house in search of his people, and when he had explored the whole field of his parish repeating the same toil again and again; those who were afflicted in mind, body, or estate receiving from him the most pronounced sympathy and brotherly help. In this way he comforted the sorrowing and the distressed and endeared himself to them. Not only was he a welcome visitor in the homes of the sick and the poor, but also in the homes of the rich, whom he never neglected. The conviction of the supreme importance of his work was ever present with him. He felt that men were lost without the gospel and that it was his particular mission to lead them to Christ. So his was a very evangelistic

ministry. He had revivals in all his charges. He did not depend upon outside agencies to awaken interest; he was his own evangelist, and many hundreds were led to identify themselves with the kingdom of God on earth. The meetings conducted by him were scenes of great spiritual power. No one could be a more indefatigable worker, and nothing either social or secular could be permitted to interfere with the complete round of his ministerial duty. The writer had much opportunity to observe his industry, and often wondered how he could endure the prodigious amount of labor under which he kept himself. Not strange that he was everywhere in demand by the church!

No honor or promotion ever came to him that he did not earn by persistent toil and genuine merit. Chancellor Sims had known and observed him, as his immediate neighbor in the pastorate in Newark, and on his recommendation, without solicitation from anybody, Syracuse University conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Divinity when he was thirty-four years of age. In 1905 New York University honored him with the degree of Doctor of Laws. He bore various responsibilities in educational matters, being trustee of Centenary Collegiate Institute, of Syracuse University, and of Drew Theological Seminary. To the General Conferences of 1896, 1900, and 1904 the Newark Conference sent Dr. Spellmeyer as a delegate. The body, in 1896, in making up its committees placed him on the Book Concern and also made him a member of the Book Committee. When the latter created a committee on the entertainment of the General Conference of 1900 they selected Dr. Spellmeyer as chairman. In this capacity he quickly demonstrated his ability in business matters and in administration. His ready grasp of all details and his superior ability, so manifest whenever he appeared before the body to give notices or to present plans, commanded close attention and great admiration from all delegates. The editor of *The Christian Advocate* well said that "successive Conferences may try in vain to find a chairman of the Entertainment Committee that will surpass him." This Conference decided upon the election of two Bishops, and on the first ballot he received 57 votes, which number steadily increased on every succeeding ballot until

on the seventh and eighth the vote of each for him was 372, being considerably more than the majority of all the votes cast; but as the rule required two thirds to elect he did not reach the requisite number. He was continued a member of the Book Committee for the next quadrennium and was placed at the head of the Entertainment Committee of the General Conference of 1904. At this time he was elected Bishop on the second ballot by 612 out of 691 votes; being the largest vote ever cast for that high office in the history of the church.

Into the episcopacy Bishop Spellmeyer brought the full application of all the energy and industry which had characterized him in the pastorate. His episcopal residence was fixed at Cincinnati, Ohio. When thousands, in a great meeting, welcomed him to the field to which he was assigned, he responded, "I give to you my heart and hand in friendliest greeting, and my promise to you is, *to do all I can, for everybody I can, in any way I can.*" We could scarcely think of one sentence that would more truly reveal the man. He at once put himself in touch with the religious forces of the city and its environment. He said, "As a pastor I have been accustomed to going to prayer meetings, and I still feel, when prayer-meeting evening comes, the need of the help the meetings bring." So he arranged with the presiding elder of the district to take him to not only one prayer meeting, but, hiring a cab, they went to four, and on other Wednesday nights they went to four others; staying a short time and talking ten or fifteen minutes in each place. He also accompanied presiding elders on their districts, visiting churches and assisting at their special services. He not only put himself in practical relation to distinctively religious movements, but proved to be very sagacious in the administration of the affairs of the church. Possessing such qualities, he was, in 1906, assigned to visit our Conferences and Missions in the Orient. He did this, traveling with his wife about 16,000 miles, being at times in great peril. While on the Yangtze River he writes: "Twice our house-boat has been wrecked, twice the bamboo rope has broken and we were at the mercy of a fierce tide and great rocks waiting for the chance to strike. Once the rope slipped from the tracker's hands with the same

perils increased somewhat by our nearness to most dangerous whirlpools and projecting sharp-edged ledges of stone. It has been hard on nerves, because some shock comes surely every day, and when it is not at hand it is always expected. But notwithstanding our anxieties, and record-breaking trip for adventure, the journey has been a great delight to me and I have had no sense of serious alarm, believing that somehow we would get ashore before the boat could sink and knowing that I was on the path of duty, where he who has faith can feel that on that road God is his companion and protection." Writing to a friend he says, "China is discontented with herself. At least she wants better things, better implements for her farmers, better scholarship for her students, and a better faith for her 400,000,000. China is building schoolhouses and railroads and electric plants. She is ready to welcome the hand that will lift her to a higher plane in the history of nations. This day is the red-letter day of opportunity for the Christian Church. If Christ were on earth to-day, saying again, 'Go' to his apostles, I do not know where he would tell them to 'begin,' but I think in this age it would be China rather than Jerusalem."

By a strange coincidence, or providence, Bishop Spellmeyer and Bishop Bashford, traveling round the world in opposite directions, reached Hong Kong at the same time; and on that day, April 4, 1907, their colleague, Bishop FitzGerald, died in the hospital in that city and they were present at the funeral service to administer comfort to the bereaved family.

The trip homeward from the Orient was retarded and the plans of it somewhat changed by the serious illness of Mrs. Spellmeyer at Bombay, India.

The last General Conference fixed the residence of Bishop Spellmeyer at Saint Louis. His yearning to be helpful to the ministers and churches in his new field sought immediate expression. Early after reaching the city where his home was to be, and fully a month before the holidays, he asked Dr. Fayette L. Thompson if it would be possible for him to visit all of the Methodist preachers in the city on the New Year Day, and asked him to look up the matter and arrange the itinerary; which the

doctor did, finding it no easy task owing to the large territory covered by Saint Louis and the considerable number of rather remote suburbs included in the plan. The purpose was to make a personal visit in one day to every member of Conference—superannuate, supply pastor, local preacher in orders—in not only the English Church, white and colored, but in the German and Scandinavian. Two motors with two expert chauffeurs were secured, one for the morning and one for the afternoon. On this trip Dr. Thompson was the Bishop's companion in the morning and the District Superintendent in the afternoon. In each case the Bishop went into the house, chatted a few minutes with the family, in most instances prayed with them, leaving his Chinese visiting card. We learn from Dr. Thompson that the effect of this plan upon the churches that were not accustomed to such attention, particularly the missions and the colored churches, was truly remarkable. It spread over the city, was commented upon in the public press, and was effectively helpful for good in every way. In connection with the same general plan Bishop Spellmeyer arranged to invite all the pastors, not only in the city, but in the neighboring city of East Saint Louis and nearby outlying towns, to meet him for an afternoon of prayer and meditation in the church of which Dr. Thompson was pastor. He asked two or three representative men to speak upon distinctively spiritual subjects. There was no attempt made to study "problems," it was a genuine "retreat." At the close the Bishop spoke to them for half an hour, a most effective address, which made a tremendous impression upon those present, and then followed it with the Holy Communion. The entire service was most profitable.

We are told that wherever he touched the city it was to bless and benefit it, and he was rapidly coming to a place of unusual influence among the religious forces of the community. He was universally esteemed and beloved by everybody whose privilege it was to meet him. After the Bishop's death Dr. Thompson had occasion to go to the hotel where he had lived, to care for the interests of Mrs. Spellmeyer and the effects of her departed husband. He was greatly impressed by the people of all classes, Jew and Gentile, seeking him out with a tearful tribute of high appre-



ciation for the influence upon them of this man of God. The situation was not easy to describe, but one of the greatest tributes to Bishop Spellmeyer's essential Christian manhood was his unconscious influence upon these people who lived in the same great family hotel with him, few of whom he knew to speak with or had met in any way.

Bishop Spellmeyer was particularly happy and strong in his work in the administration of an Annual Conference. As a presiding officer he commanded the highest respect, being very proficient in parliamentary usage and very graceful in his deportment in the chair. His brotherly spirit was so manifest that confidence was immediately awakened in the hearts of his brethren. They felt that he comprehended all the delicacies of the situation and would be absolutely fair in the exercise of his responsibility. He impressed men as being so refined, so gentle, and yet so strong. He studied with great care every particular case. The interests of the church and the interests of the pastor were both dear to him. He took the needs of his brethren upon his heart and determined to do for every man the best that could be done. This common sentiment, that he was a very brotherly man, was expressed in the Conferences where he presided. He encouraged each one to come to him with perfect frankness, telling him the needs of his case. He did not ask for the maintaining of secrecy in reference to the appointments. He preferred to have the problem openly and clearly worked out, giving patient attention to all representations or appeals made to him. His open-heartedness and gentleness were not, however, any sign of a lack of firmness. At the close of a Conference session, when the appointments had been read, he was perfectly willing to meet and talk with any disappointed man.

Bishop Berry, in congratulating the Genesee Conference upon the fact that Bishop Spellmeyer was to be their presiding officer, characterized him as "manly, brotherly, level-headed, discriminating, and sympathetic," and after that Conference had been held all felt that the words of Bishop Berry had been verified. Such echoes of his work were heard wherever this official duty called him. A writer from the Pittsburgh Conference spoke of



him as "humble, sympathetic, approachable, graceful, and tactful in administration, a fervent preacher of the gospel, a man upon whom the church can look with justifiable pride at any time and under any circumstances."

The pecuniary necessities and embarrassments of men in the Conferences where he presided appealed to him strongly, and for the relief of such cases he maintained a fund. When he received compensation for special services, such as dedications, or other occasions, deducting the mere amount of personal expense, he would place the remainder with this fund and sacredly devote it to the relief of his brethren who might be in need.

Why a life so beautiful, strong, and useful should have reached its earthly close so early is hard to comprehend. Bishop Henry Spellmeyer was born in New York city, November 25, 1847, and died in Atlantic City, N. J., March 12, 1910. There he had presided three full days in the New Jersey Conference, winning all hearts by his fraternal spirit and felicitous bearing. He was particularly happy in his administration on Friday, when the candidates were being received, and it seemed as if every man in the Conference was being prepared to expect a just outcome of the proceedings of the session. None could have thought that they were looking upon his face for the last time, or that when the assembly should come together on the morrow they would be startled with the sad news, "Bishop Spellmeyer is dead." He literally worked to the very last. His motto had always been, "Nothing must interfere with my duty," and nothing did until God said, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." How fitting that when it was the Father's good will to take him home his chariot should have ascended from the midst of his own New Jersey friends. This, Dr. Fred Clare Baldwin, of the Newark Conference, has beautifully expressed in the following lines:

Here had he caught the Master's call;  
Here had he served unceasingly;  
Here was he known and loved of all—  
Here by the Eastern sea.

Here were the friends of the days of yore;  
Here were the comrades he loved to greet;  
Here were the homes with the open door—  
Here was the welcome sweet.

Here was the soil that he loved to tread;  
Here was the land of the smiling sky;  
Here was the place where his heart had bled—  
Here he came home to die!

*George W. Smith*

ART. II.—RECONSTRUCTION IN THEOLOGY AMONG  
LAYMEN

EACH age must be its own interpreter of truth. This necessity belongs to every field of thought, the religious field no less than others. A statement of theology is not a revelation but an interpretation of religious truth; and if every age must be its own interpreter it is hardly conceivable that the men of this generation can occupy precisely the theological position that obtained in the prior generation. Josiah Strong, writing on the subject, "What My Faith Means to Me," says that "the past fifty years have been probably the most interesting half century in the history of the world; and doubtless the two great revolutions which have taken place—the one in the world of thought, the other in the physical world—requiring a double readjustment of life, have put as great a strain on religious faith as it is likely to suffer at any time." Dr. Strong's own religious experience covered precisely that period, and enabled him to make a readjustment of faith and life which was of vital importance to him. Not alone without the loss of faith was this change made, but with unspeakable gain of conviction, of joy, and of usefulness. He believes that the vast majority of the members of our churches have not yet made this readjustment, that many are in the midst of the process, and that not a few are losing their way. These are some of the very points involved in our inquiry. We are asking if there is any experience in the thinking of laymen that justifies the phraseology of our theme. If so, can the outlines of reconstruction be determined and its tendencies pointed out? It is well to note that the meaning of the term "reconstruction" as applied to the theology of laymen is not the same as when applied to that of the specialist in theology; for it is not a scientific process, a logical structure built for the purpose of influencing the thought of the times. It is rather a growth of ideas, perhaps chiefly a subconscious growth, with a root that is vital and practical instead of logical and speculative.

Among laymen there is a manifest reaching out after a more

satisfactory concept of the basic doctrines of Christianity. Their deficiencies in these matters they frankly admit, and any help offered in a broad, sympathetic, undogmatic spirit would be welcome. As far as the writer's knowledge goes very little has been published touching this theme, and nothing at all on the layman's view of particular doctrines. We have therefore attempted to secure from laymen themselves their doctrinal beliefs with the idea of learning what influence, if any, the new habit of thought among scholars has had upon them. While our theme seems to cover a broader field than this investigation, we would justify the procedure, if possible, by saying that the views of a number of laymen other than Methodist were secured, that a few Methodist brethren in different parts of the country were heard from, and that, besides, we had access to several published articles and books treating the subject in a general way, and in all cases the results corresponded with conclusions drawn from an inquiry directed in particular to laymen of the Rock River Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The raw material, then, consists of replies made to two sets of doctrinal questions covering substantially the same ground. The questions in the first set were so framed as to avoid biasing the response, and to admit of the fullest freedom of expression. The laymen were informed of the purpose of the inquiry, and of the need of perfect frankness in statement, their names to be held in confidence. The type of men interrogated was modern men, men "controlled by the forces that are making to-morrow," men of thought and action who were at once able and willing to express themselves. No effort was made to first ascertain their theological position, whether conservative or progressive. The questions of the second set were so phrased as to be answerable by yes, no, in doubt, and the like, the special object of this series being to reach a larger and more representative class, a truer average among laymen. In all, two hundred and thirty-six out of seven hundred persons responded, representing business and professional life, agricultural and mechanical pursuits, the active and the inactive in the church, the old and the middle-aged, men and women, but chiefly men. The extent of the replies reached all the way from the simple answers

"yes" and "no," to articles of twenty-five hundred words and over, which is an indication of the interest that the laymen have taken in this venture.

**The Laymen's Views on Specific Doctrines.**—Considering now the results of our inquiry, we shall note, first, the laymen's views on specific doctrines and then some general tendencies indicative of reconstruction in their theology.

**God.**—Concerning the nature and the character of God much confusion exists, and there is no little difficulty found in conceiving him as a spirit, or as a personality without definite form. To many minds God is either the great impersonal oversoul of the universe or a personal being so vague as to be almost impossible of approach. The following quotations give some idea of the variety of conceptions: "God is an impassive intelligence," "I think of God somewhat as I think of the ether, or universal force from which all energy emanates," "He radiates from a central position as possibly the sun or Sirius," "I despair of companionship with him as the Father but I see him in the Saviour," "I do not know what a spirit is," "God's whereabouts and his relation to the universe I cannot conceive," "He is the author of both good and evil." One of the more thoughtful replies reads thus: "God, as he appears to me, is an infinite spirit pervading the universe as life pervades the body. He manifests himself not only through the material creation, but in the mental and moral universe as well. Not only is he the infinite and eternal energy from which all things proceed, but he is also that eternal power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness."

**Man.**—The laymen agree with Hamlet when he says: "What a piece of work is man! How noble in reason! How infinite in faculty! In form, in moving, how express and admirable! In action how like an angel! In apprehension how like a god! The beauty of the world, the paragon of animals!" But they differ on the question of his origin, fifty-five per cent accepting literally the Genesis account—that is, direct creation—thirty-three per cent holding to some evolutionary process with God as its life, while the balance have not made up their minds.

Unconditional Immortality of the soul is accepted by eighty-

three per cent, conditional immortality by seven and one half per cent, immortality of any sort is denied by three per cent, while six per cent are unsettled in their view.

**Sin.**—Inability to define sin is confessed by many of the laymen, though some creditable definitions are given, but all declare that sin is real. Its origin is attributed variously to Adam, Satan, man's selfishness, moral free agency, and to God himself. Of the doctrine of Total Depravity a large number of the respondents seem to be totally ignorant, and all but a few repudiate it with scorn.

**Christ.**—Although a few laymen ignored the questions asked under this head, the majority showed keen interest in this subject of vital and central importance to Christian theology. "Do you accept the Virgin Birth?" was the first question, to which seventy-eight per cent answered, "Yes," ten and three fourths per cent, "No," eleven and one fourth per cent, "In doubt." That is to say, twenty-two per cent either doubt or deny the Virgin Birth; and a large proportion of those taking the affirmative as well as of those taking the negative side regard the matter as of little or no importance. The second question concerns the Deity of Christ. In order to avoid misunderstanding the question was so stated as to distinguish between deity and divinity. In reply ninety-one and one fourth per cent accept the Deity of Christ; six per cent do not, and three and three fourths per cent are in doubt; so that nearly ten per cent either deny or doubt the truth of this doctrine, the prevailing reason being that a God-man could not be an example to us, but a perfect man would be both example and inspiration to the rest of mankind. The third question relates to the Atonement; and here we find a decided breaking away from the governmental theory. As was expected, a large number of the laymen either ignored the doctrine or expressed ignorance thereof or inability to understand it. In answer to specific questions fifty-seven and one half per cent believe that the suffering of Christ was endured as a substitute for the penalty of man's sin; twenty-one per cent deny it; eleven and three fourths per cent are in doubt; fifty-seven and one half per cent believe the suffering was necessary in order to make the forgiveness of sins consistent with God's moral government;



twelve per cent make denial; twenty-two and one half per cent are in doubt. To the question, "Was the suffering of Christ necessary in order to secure a change in God's attitude toward the sinner?" only twenty-three per cent answered, "Yes"; eighty-six and three fourths per cent believe that the change to be effected was in the attitude of the sinner toward God.

The word vicarious has many foes, but they are arrayed against the word as used in certain theories of the atonement, particularly the suffering of the innocent for the guilty as a means of squaring the account of the guilty with the judge. This attitude thus is expressed for not a few of the responding laymen by a vigorous business man of Chicago: "Atonement? I'm not a bit orthodox here. My belief is simple and direct. Man is not as the naughty schoolboy, sickly and deserving punishment, but unable to bear it, who was saved from the wrath of the teacher by the strong fellow who took the punishment, and who thereby preserved the dignity and the justice of the school. No; I cannot accept the idea of the atonement that Christ died for us in order to save us from the wrath of the great teacher—God. To me Christ died to show men the terrible character, nature, and result of sin. Let me explain by a comparatively recent incident: The Iroquois Theater fire revealed to Chicago the result of poor laws and consequent unsafe buildings, some of which were the result of man's greed. Nearly 600 lives atoned for this sin, in that Chicago saw then its terrible condition and made amends, satisfaction, reparation, by new laws and by better buildings. Christ did the same things, in spirit at least, for mankind. Necessary? Yes, because of man's sinful condition, not because God demanded it to appease his wrath."

A layman educated in the law but engaged in business writes: "In the matter of the atonement of Christ, I am acquainted somewhat with what the books and preachers have said about it being the absolute paying of a debt by the offering of himself as a sacrifice. But the interpretation that this was the only mission of Christ has never satisfied me. It seems insufficient, inadequate. But it seems to me that the purpose was a broader one; that man had misunderstood God, and it became necessary, in order that

man might become reconciled to God and made to understand him, that one should be sent from the Father's own family, a part of his own personality, to live as a man among men, to teach man the Fatherhood of God; his true attitude toward man and his accessibility to man. The death of Christ was in a sense vicarious. He did give up his life for us, and the weight of the world's sin was no doubt a terrible, dragging burden on his soul. It was necessary that he should die for us and rise again in order that the gateway to forgiveness might be plainly left open to us; that we might have no doubt of his full belief in the principles of life he taught us, and that we might have no doubt of his divinity and of his being the accredited representative of God himself."

**The Holy Spirit.**—On no doctrine is there such variety of ideas, so much vagueness and confusion of thought. A few replies will suffice to show the situation as disclosed. The Holy Spirit is the third Person in the Trinity to twenty-two and one half per cent of the laymen; to twenty-seven and one half per cent he is God working in the souls of men. Other groups say: "The Spirit of Christ," "The spiritual manifestation of God and Christ in one," "God's influence on the earth, it being here in the place of Christ," "Not a separate being," "The Comforter," "I have no idea of the Holy Spirit, but accept it," "Am without experience or reliable observation," "I cannot conceive of the Holy Spirit as in any sense separate from God. My idea is that what is generally termed the Holy Spirit is a spiritual consciousness of divine favor or approval, and it is a result rather than a cause of a state of harmony with God."

**Personal Salvation.**—All but five per cent believe that in order to be saved every sinner must have a "change of heart." Replies to the question, "What does personal salvation mean to you?" are given in such terms as these: "Obedience to God and the giving up of the human will," "The gift of God through Christ," "Acceptance of Christ as a personal Saviour," "Escape, not from penalty, but from sin," "A right attitude toward God."

**The Future.**—What heaven and hell are like may not be of vital importance in theology, but, all Christians being interested in the future life, there is some value in knowing how the laymen

regard the hope of the redeemed and the despair of the lost. Thus forty-four and one half per cent of our respondents believe heaven to be a literal place, forty-four and three fourths per cent believe it to be a spiritual state, the balance being in doubt. It is significant of the modern revolt against the theological hell of fifty years ago that, while forty-four and one half per cent of the laymen regard heaven as a literal place, only twenty-four and one half per cent of this number are logical enough to take a similar view of hell, sixty-four and one half per cent referring to hell as a spiritual state. As to the Final Restoration of the lost, sixteen per cent believe in it, and thirty-two per cent have not yet settled the question. Nearly two per cent believe the wicked are annihilated. The Resurrection of the Body is held to be spiritual by sixty-three per cent, physical by twenty-five per cent, the balance being in doubt. Not a few repudiate the idea of a simultaneous resurrection, though in most instances no reference is made thereto. Where reference is made the prevailing idea seems to be in favor of a spiritual resurrection at the time of death.

The Bible.—In answer to specific questions fifty-one and three fourths per cent of the laymen admit that modern teachings respecting the Bible have caused them to modify their idea of the Book. But ninety-one and one half per cent declare that the Bible means more to them than formerly; seven per cent that it means the same; while only one and seven eighths per cent confess that it means less.

The Church.—“Should the church place greater emphasis on social salvation?” This question is answered by seventy-three and three fourths per cent in the affirmative, by fourteen per cent in the negative, the balance being in doubt. “Is the church necessary to Christian living?” Seventy-three per cent answer, “Yes,” sixteen per cent, “No”; “A great help” is the reply substituted by fourteen per cent. “Does the church satisfy your spiritual needs?” Forty-eight and one half per cent reply in the affirmative, forty-three and three fourths per cent in the negative, the balance not feeling sure.

Most of the laymen believe that the church is fulfilling its mission, in part at least; the general opinion of the church being

that, in spite of its faults, it is the greatest and most useful institution in the world, without which civilization could not move forward, nor even stand.

**Certain Tendencies Among Laymen Looking Toward a Reconstruction or a Restatement of Theology.**—While no questions were asked designed to elicit from the laymen any expression regarding their attitude toward formal doctrine, as such, a large number of opinions were voluntarily offered in which dissatisfaction is shown not with the Christian religion, nor yet with the type of religion prevailing to-day, but with the intellectual expressions of its meaning. The laymen seem to feel that these expressions lack reality; that they do not voice the experience of the modern man, that they do not represent convictions able to give an honest account of themselves and that they are too remote from a personal confession of faith, which alone in these days carries conviction. Of formal doctrine the thinking layman appears to be deeply suspicious. He fears it as a free man fears the ball and chain. To him it stands for bondage, mental and spiritual. As one respondent puts it: "Every man is entitled to a creed, but how can a church prescribe one creed for different grades of intellect? Creeds prevent growth. They are usually made by those who have ceased to grow, and thus they perpetuate ignorance and, in a measure, superstition." Some of the reasons for this suspicion of formal doctrine are stated by Benjamin A. Millard in the *Hibbert Journal*, and they are brought out in the replies to our questionnaire as well as in the personal remarks here and there appended.

The modern layman obviously labors under a misapprehension as to the origin and the function of formal doctrine which authority has created and from which men are slow to free their minds. Not being able to readily appreciate this, he naturally supposes that the value of creeds lies outside of experience; that this value is inherent, and perhaps magical. How be it he has little or no interest in theology "so remote," says Millard, "in its terms and methods of thought from the modern atmosphere and attitude." Doubtless the terms and methods of thought belonging to the earlier theology seem so remote from our modern atmosphere

because of the mechanical analogies used for purposes of explanation. In these days, when the religious life is regarded by rapidly increasing numbers of people as a personal relationship, the growing religious experience as a matter of deepening acquaintance with God and with men, "Mechanical expressions of doctrine," says Professor H. C. King, "are not tolerated by thoughtful men. All legal and governmental analogies applied, for example, to the doctrine of the Atonement fail to strike a responding chord in their religious life. Such analogies leave our relation to God too external and mechanical, and fail to bring it home to us as a moral reality." Another reason for the widespread lay prejudice against theology is "the note of finality with which theology has been presented." Men who are themselves growing in their views of life and experience, of God and the universe; men who say (quoting from our respondents), "My views are not the same as formerly, they have changed with my growth," or, "They have become enlarged," or, "I try to keep an open mind so as to glean truth from every field that opens to me," or again, "In my opinion one of the great errors of the clergy in the past, not entirely eradicated in the present, is that the essential element in the church should be simply agreement in belief. If one thousandth part of the effort put forth in the past to secure agreement in belief had been expended to secure right living, the work of the church would have been far more successful." Men of this manner of thought cannot tolerate the argument of creed-makers (or at least what they conceive to be the argument) that "What is true to me now must be true to all men and eternally true." Formerly men received this argument, but now its validity for an ever-increasing number of them is gone. They resent an individual or church laying down hard-and-fast barriers, declaring that truth cannot pass over them. Neither do they tolerate the note of authority which has in the past controlled the presentation of doctrine. They refuse to be "spoon-fed with authoritative utterances of church and priest." Truth must appeal to them as truth before it can dominate them, and it can appeal to them as truth only after a process of assimilation. External authority ignores or it crushes down the element of personality, which is just what personality resents. Men now



feel, as do the adolescent, that they desire to look into things for themselves and to draw their own conclusions. One layman, in his reply to our questionnaire, after enumerating the various writings besides the Bible that have influenced his views, says, "In all this inquiry, however, I have regarded my own consciousness as the final arbiter of what I should believe." Nearly all the respondents replied to the question, "What do you regard as the basis of authority for your views?" But none of them answered, The creed of the Church; not even those who, by their replies, showed attachment to the creeds; but nearly all mentioned the Bible and their own consciousness as the real basis of authority.

Another tendency among laymen is to demand a practical test of doctrine. Pragmatism in theology, whatever will work in the conduct of life, strengthening and enriching it, appeals to the laymen. The words of a single respondent will be interesting at this point. He says:

I think the masses of thinking men reject theology and the tests based upon it; and it is, perhaps, this which, to some extent, keeps them from identifying themselves with the church. The church first demands that a man believe what seems to him unreasonable, and against all his observation and experience, before its membership is open to him and before he can get its helpful influence of common fellowship. Dr. Grenfell has struck the keynote in first appealing to the worker to come and help in the Master's vineyard, and let the purely intellectual attitude toward doctrinal questions be a matter of development along natural and not forced lines. No man of normal pride relishes the attitude of the church, namely, "You have got to believe thus and so." They won't stand for this in social and business relations, and are too scrupulous to say that they believe when they do not believe. Some of the round-about explanations I have heard people make of the Apostles' Creed, which I do not repeat because I do not believe those fourteenth century materialisms, show that it either forces many to violate their real ideas, or else they repeat it without thinking of what they are saying. If the appeal to the Christian life were based on its being a start for a loving Father, and that everyone could make this start and begin here and now to receive his help for their daily life, and that by service they could learn to love him, and by saving others could save themselves, it would be a stronger appeal than a doctrinal appeal that seems unnatural and unreasonable.

This quotation not only places the emphasis upon the practical test of doctrine, but voices the thoroughly ethical conception



of personal salvation for which the laymen seem to stand. There was a time, not far in the past, either, when the doctrine of salvation by faith alone eventuated quite generally in a divorce between religion and ethics. Many people who enjoyed a high-wrought emotional experience, who prayed much and diligently toiled during revival seasons to win souls to Christ, did yet live such lives as would hardly bear the scrutiny of a friend. Religion seemed to be largely a device for avoiding character. One of our respondents refers to those days in this way: "I was brought up in a Methodist community, and where there were also United Brethren, some of whom were my relatives. Many believed that the organ was the work of the devil, and it caused a split in the church. They had revivals of six and eight weeks and had conversions just as real and sincere as could be."

Varied as are the answers to our question concerning personal salvation, the general tone is distinctly ethical. While almost all of the laymen declare that because a man lives a good moral life in the ordinary sense of the term he is not necessarily religious, and that good morals is not sufficient for salvation, yet they make clear that their idea of salvation demands character as well as faith, the emphasis being placed on right conduct toward God and toward man. It would seem, then, that this growing ethical conception of salvation must modify some of the old theological statements if the layman's respect for theology is to grow with his growth.

There is a suspicion abroad that the present movement in theology is a Unitarian drift. However that may be outside of Methodism, we do not believe it true inside. While our reasons for this are drawn chiefly from conditions in the Rock River Conference, we assume that these conditions are fairly representative of intelligent Methodism throughout the country. What we do find is not a Unitarian drift, but a growing emphasis on the humanity of Christ without denying his Deity. About thirteen years ago a faculty member of a Methodist theological school delivered a baccalaureate sermon on "The Humanity of Christ," in which he insisted that greater emphasis be placed there. The tone of the sermon implied that this emphasis was comparatively

new in orthodox churches, but that necessity demanded it. At the same time he made it clear that he accepted the Deity of Christ; and that in emphasizing his humanity caution should be used lest his Deity be overshadowed. But this very emphasis is one of the influences leading some of our laymen over to the Unitarian position. They do not seem to realize that the church is insisting more and more on the human in Jesus; nor do they understand, apparently, that they can stress his humanity without denying his Deity. For example, such statements as the following have come to our notice: "If Christ was a man, and perfect, that is an inspiration to me. Maybe I can be perfect, too. If he was God, what good is that to me?" Again, "He was not God, otherwise he would not be an example of what man should be." Others do not accept the Deity of Christ because of the metaphysical difficulty involved. We believe that if doubting laymen could obtain a different point of view, such as can be had from a straightforward historical study of the character of Christ, instead of metaphysical speculation about him, it would lead to results more desirable. They might be shown, as Richard Morris argues in the *Hibbert Journal*, that "sinful men can or they cannot work out their own salvation. If they can, a divine man is superfluous; if they cannot, a divine man is powerless to help them and can only discourage them. Mankind is either above or below any benefit which such a man can bestow. . . . A divine man would have served only to reveal the world's misery: the God-man removes it. A divine man would have driven all men in terror from himself; the God-man draws men unto himself"—even as he said, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me." The character and work of Christ duly emphasized and correctly interpreted is doubtless the most successful method of impressing men with the truth of his Deity. The Christian religion is admittedly Christocentric, but certain intellectually cautious people should learn that this fact has deeper meaning than the mere leadership of Christ; for it means that he is the central fact and person through whom all that belongs to the characteristic life of Christendom is mediated, "revelation and faith, conversion and comfort of forgiveness, the joy of faith, and the

service of love, lonely communion with God, and life in Christian fellowship." It would seem that anyone who could thus meet all the spiritual needs of men must be more than a man, though perfect. Let this be accepted as a fact, let the average layman grasp through Jesus Christ that spiritual reality without which life is empty and desolate, then creeds, dogmas, ecclesiastical traditions, seem quite hollow and useless to him. If he may but call God Father, then to him Calvinism and Arminianism are trifling matters in comparison. If he believes that the Spirit of Christ is in the world saving it, then Unitarianism and Trinitarianism seem to him mere word quibbles, terms forged by human intellects to express one or another phase of the truth as it appeared to them. The Master himself obviously cared little for terms except as they hindered those who believed them instead of believing him.

This, we hold, approximately represents the modern layman's attitude toward systematic theology. What theology he has is vital instead of mechanical, a growing plant instead of a fossil. And since laymen constitute the bulk of Christian believers it seems clear, as the Right Rev. C. D. Williams, Bishop of Michigan, declares, that "The church cannot remake religion, cannot shrink it into the old convenient and conventional type, cannot crowd it back again into the old doctrinal and ecclesiastical forms. Religion made the church in the first place and it must remake it to-day—remake it into the natural and hospitable home of all that is best and highest in our modern life and world."

*Edward G. Schutz.*

## ART. III.—THE ORGANIC UNITY OF METHODISM

ORGANIC unity is not a panacea for all ecclesiastical ills. The Christian church was never so corrupt and despotic as it was when it had a unity of organization. Denominations have had and still have their uses, and yet there may be times when denominational oneness may have some advantages.

Years ago certain bodies were formed by persons who withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and there is no doubt the Methodist Episcopal Church would gladly welcome them if they returned. Away back in 1865, forty-seven years ago, and, since, at various times the bishops of this church made overtures to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, but they were not successful. In 1874 the General Conference of that church declared "corporate union" to be "undesirable and impracticable," but the suggestion of union is heard from time to time. So in regard to union on the part of the Methodist Protestant Church, something has been said, and a few years ago one might have thought the union was sure to take place in a very short time.

If these bodies offered to come into the Methodist Episcopal Church just as it is they certainly would receive a cordial welcome. If that were all the matter would be very simple, for in individual cases that very thing is occurring from time to time. But suppose these bodies would propose to combine as bodies and present terms of union which would require concessions which, if granted, would so modify the Methodist Episcopal Church that this church would cease to be the present Methodist Episcopal Church. Then many difficulties would instantly appear. The demands would have to be scrutinized and their probable effects would have to be considered. Suppose one body should demand that the Methodist Episcopal Church give up its episcopacy and so destroy its identity. The church would probably consider whether it should make that sacrifice merely to make a bigger ecclesiastical body. Or suppose the church should be asked to abandon its historic ritual. The church, doubtless, would pause and ask what would be gained by the destruction of that distinc-

tive feature. Suppose it were demanded that the Methodist Episcopal Church give up its territorial oneness and that the whole country be cut up into sectional bodies, each section being self-governing, so that there would be practically, or actually, just so many sectional churches, instead of one non-sectional church, for the United States of America. Would the Methodist Episcopal Church consent to have itself thus bisected, and dissected, and be a party to divisions that would not make for the unity of the nation? Suppose it was insisted that the dividing line should not run north and south, but east and west, along the course of the Ohio River, thus throwing into the South hundreds of thousands of white members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of colored members. Would the Methodist Episcopal Church agree to such a professed union which would be practical, and actual, disunion?

Suppose these sectional bodies were autonomous, each making its own laws and electing its own bishops and other general officers, what compensation would there be in a nominal over-body that practically, or actually, had no direct and real authority? Would the church be willing to regard this division into sections as a union, or, rather, would it not consider the professed union a false pretense to cover an actual disintegration and regard the nominal over-body as a mere figurehead and a sham?

Now, if all the propositions were acceptable, what would be necessary to bring about the organic unity, or, more specifically, if all the terms are satisfactory, who in the Methodist Episcopal Church can legally bring about such a result? Some seem to assume that all that would be necessary would be a motion, or resolution, presented in and adopted by the General Conference; but could the General Conference, of and by itself, effect such a combination and bind the church to its acceptance?

It must be remembered that though the General Conference has great power, it does not possess all power. It cannot do everything, for it is a limited body, with greatly restricted powers, and it is not the church in action excepting so far as the church has given it constitutional power, for the church is above the General Conference and the church made and limited that body.



The General Conference can make rules and regulations for the Methodist Episcopal Church, within certain limitations, but it cannot disband the church or make a new or different church any more than it can make a new constitution or go contrary to the existing constitution.

It is one thing to permit an individual, or a body of individuals, to come into or join the church, for that would merely involve the acceptance of the laws and doctrines of the church, but it is a very different thing to effect a combination with another church, or to permit the other church to combine with our church, when the combination implies or requires concessions and changes which modify our church and make it different from what it was in doctrines, or government, or territorial bounds within the limits of the United States of America.

Such concessions and combination would be equivalent to the most radical change in the constitution of the church and would be the actual destruction of the present Methodist Episcopal Church, as well as of its constitution. It would be equivalent to the dissolution or disbandment of the present church and the making of a new denomination. The old Methodist Episcopal Church would cease to be, and the old other church would cease to be, and the result of the blending would be a new and different church.

Plainly no General Conference has power to do this. It cannot change a single phrase or item in the constitution, much less make such a wholesale change in the organism. The General Conference does not possess the power to make such a union or disunion as the case may be. It cannot make a dissolution of the church and blend the dissolved church with another similarly dissolved church.

For such a purpose the General Conference is not the church, or even the agent of the church. The General Conference is not the whole church, and it has not been empowered by the church to make such a radical change, and, therefore, the church cannot be committed to such an action until it has been authorized by the whole church.

To say the least, such an organic union with another church



cannot be made without the constitutional vote of the entire Methodist Episcopal Church—that is to say, the vote of the General Conference, the vote of the combined ministry in the Annual Conferences, and the vote of the combined laity in the Lay Electoral Conferences—and to get that vote would require at least four years, even if all were willing.

How much probability there is that the church would favor a combination, or so-called organic union, that meant actually or practically the destruction of the present Methodist Episcopal Church, limited space does not now permit us to say.

*Thomas B. Neely.*

## ART. IV.—THE ART OF PREVAILING PRAYER

THE late Arthur T. Pierson wrote: "If there be any lost art in the church of God, it is the art of prevailing prayer; and with that is also lost the art of winning souls, of walking with God, and serving him in the power of the Spirit."

I am not in sympathy with this statement of that eminent man of God, and believe that such utterances tend to create the very thing deplored. It undoubtedly may be made, with all accuracy, of individuals, but it cannot be truthfully made of the body of believers which is the church. Prayer continues to prevail. There are Peniels on every mountain slope. Elijahs are invoking fire from heaven on many a Carmel altar. The silence of every night is broken by the cry of many a Moses in the agony of intercessory prayer. If at this moment our ears could be made as sensitive as those of the all-hearing Father, out of the stillness would rush the surge and thunder of many supplications: from out of Hannah's loneliness, and David's sin, and Solomon's worship, and Jeremiah's despair, and Isaiah's hope; out of Bethel, Hermon, Gethsemane, and the upper room. If we could trace to their springs the streams of blessing that are enriching our community we would come to lonely places where men are wrestling with the angel of the covenant or to the altars of God's house where worshipers are on their knees.

The church has not lost the art of prevailing prayer. Should such a calamity occur, the church would cease to live. Can the body live when the breath ceases? Nor can the church; for "prayer is the Christian's vital breath." Nevertheless, there are many of us who fear at times that we personally have lost the art. At least, our prayers do not seem to prevail. And this apparent failure has withered our confidence in the efficacy of prayer to such a degree as to rob it of its zest and joy. It becomes as lifeless as the counting of beads or the pinning of petitions on a revolving wheel. We say prayers, but do not pray. Our thesis will compel a homiletical, rather than a literary, form of discussion; but when men of eminence are deploring what they

call a "lost art" it is worth our while to place in their hands again the golden thread which they have dropped and which will unerringly guide them to the hidden places where the lost treasure may be found. We write with confidence, because we have inspired authority, in naming four elements of efficacious prayer which, when combined, bring swift and unmistakable answers:

First, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, he will give it you." Six times in a single discourse does Jesus name this element of efficacy in prayer, indicating the value he himself placed upon it. Whatever else it may mean, it certainly includes three things: To ask a thing in his name is to ask only that which he approves. That is our Lord's own interpretation of the expression. "If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done unto you." What he teaches here is not that personal goodness is the secret of prevailing prayer, but that because of what he is, as our Redeemer, we can approach the Father unhindered by any fears that arise out of our sense of sin. While we know that "if I regard iniquity in my heart the Lord will not hear me," we find no suggestion in all the Scriptures that prayer prevails because of personal merit. The Pharisee stood and prayed, "I do . . . I am," but he was not justified. On the other hand, the publican, who was conscious only of his sinfulness, was heard. So when we come to God in Christ's name we come with no personal claim, but simply "abide in him." Our wish merges into his and our thoughts are absorbed in "my words." Our prayer accords with what he approves.

A second thing is meant by the expression *in his name*; that is, by his authority. Many things which are the burden of our prayers Christ has already secured for us by his own act. All spiritual blessings are such—as pardon, the gift of the Holy Ghost, all those virtues that arise out of the indwelling Spirit, all those external conditions that come of an exalted spiritual character, the new life that is the Life Eternal. These all are the riches of his grace which he himself has secured for us. Even before we ask they are ours *de jure*. When we want them, and open our hearts to receive, they are ours *de facto*. Before Christ did his work of love, when men came to God with their wants

they had but one ground of appeal—his mercy. "Have mercy upon me," was their cry. Now we cry *in his name*. By right of the covenant oath God made with his Son, we make our appeal. And it is that that gives to prayer its mysterious efficiency.

Akin to this is a third thing to be named. Indeed, all three of these primary colors shade into each other, as do those of the spectrum, so as not to be sharply defined, but it is this interblending which makes the unity which is the product of them all. To ask in Jesus's name is to ask by virtue of our personal union with him. The name stands for his person; and to ask God *in him* means that the petitioner lays aside all thought of his own wisdom, strength, or merit, and derives his confidence solely from the personal worth of Christ. The prayer then becomes the aspiration which his love inspires. Thus the petitioner's approach is not alone his own, but Christ's as well. He voices out his Lord's want. There is sympathy between the Intercessor before the throne and the Christian in his closet. In such communion Christ's attitude toward our petition becomes absorbing in our minds and gives confidence when we pray. "The Father hears *him* pray, his dear anointed one." When we are one *in him* he prays not simply for us; he prays in us and by us.

The second element of prevailing prayer is already present in the one we have named, but needs to be considered separately if we would realize its far-reaching potency. In our spectrum the blue shades into the yellow, but farther down it disappears and an unmixed yellow casts a golden glory over the theme. "If we ask anything *according to his will*, he doeth it." Here is an element of peculiar strength which nevertheless sometimes withers the heart and paralyzes the tongue of prayer. Why ask God to do what he wills? The fact that he wills a thing precludes the necessity of prayer. This is the wintry blast that screams its icy untruth into "the still hour" and congeals the faith of him who comes to pray. But a moment's reflection will dispel that baneful sophistry. "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of these little ones should perish." Then why are so many little ones perishing, not only in the slums but in our churches and homes as well? Is it not largely because we

do not accord heartily in prayer with that will of God which would turn us into willing agents of his purpose? Again, "This is the will of God, even your sanctification." Then why are our hearts so divided with love of self and the world, and oftentimes so unclean? If we prayed "according to his will" we would sweep out all debasing self-service and self-worship, lest any treacherous thing should rob him of his rights; we would thrust out every rival of Christ. Then the spirit of power would rush in like a mighty wind, cleanse the consecrated place of all its foulness, and the glory of the Highest would dwell there. God's will is sovereign, but he chooses to work amid numberless free wills for the furtherance of his purpose. He who by prayer merges his will into the divine is allied to Omnipotence.

There are some who seem to think that to prevail *with* God means to triumph *over* God, to induce him to do things which they themselves cannot do. It is an unhappy misconception of a sublime truth, and is sure to result in debilitating doubt and prevent the very thing the words express. Such power would be to turn Omnipotence from the course it has chosen into lines of unwisdom. But God cannot consent to that. He is too wise to repeat the blunder of Apollo and allow the child Phaëton to take the reins of the chariot of the sun which he could not direct aright. God never surrenders his power; but he does impart it to those who are qualified to use it as he is using it, they becoming the agents of his purpose. His beneficent method is seen in the realm of Nature. In combating Nature as an enemy, we are crushed by it. In reverencing it, and loving and obeying it, it is our servant. Bacon says, "We command Nature by obeying her." Thus, opposing God's will, we are crushed by it, but in accord with it, we are girdled with his power. Hence the sublimity as well as the wisdom of this element of prevailing prayer.

A third element to be named is earnestness. "With all thy heart," is the biblical expression. Prayer is essentially an act of the heart; understanding by the heart not simply the seat of the emotions, but the innermost of our being, where every attribute of the soul is active in its profoundest deeps. It is there rather than with the lips that a man really prays. Because this



innermost is so manifold in its activity it is difficult to state in a sentence what is included in prayer *with all the heart*. Prayer is the communion of the heart with God, but in its utterance it breaks into sevenfold prismatic speech: adoration, praise, petition, thanksgiving, confession, supplication, and intercession. But when we have compressed all these forms of utterance in our prayer it is not yet necessarily "with all thy heart." It may still be formal, routine, mechanical, and not of the heart at all. The real prayer lies back of the utterance, in the thought, the desire, the attitude of the heart toward God. The prevailing prayer comes out of a deep sense of need with profound earnestness. In Luke 18 Jesus relates two parables, in one of which the importunate widow and in the other the penitent publican prevail in prayer. The point of resemblance in which lies the secret of the efficiency of both is that they were in desperate earnest.

This is the feature of all the great historic prayers that prevailed. Recall Jacob on the slopes above Jabbok, "I will not let thee go"; Moses amid the crags of Sinai, "Forgive them, but if not, blot me out of thy book"; Hannah at Shiloh; Elijah on Carmel; Paul in tears, desperate over his thorn. Modern history is crowded with examples. Indeed, we know of no great movement in the uplift of humanity but within and behind it we find mighty men on their knees: Savonarola in Florence, Knox in Edinburgh, Wesley in England, Livingstone in Africa, Havelock in India, Washington at Valley Forge, Booth in London, Lincoln in the White House, and a great multitude of witnesses "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, . . . of whom the world was not worthy." Let any earnest man turn the pages of his own life history and he will find some instance in which his prayers prevailed. When? When out of the depths he cried unto the Lord; when sin was strangling his soul like a serpent's coil; when some awful woe was pending—it was then he dropped his rosary with its beads and shook off the shackles of a book with its prescribed times and seasons. Out of a breaking heart prayer poured forth in groans that could not be uttered. It was then he prayed *with all his*

heart. This great truth is attested by the example of Christ. If we can safely judge by the few instances the evangelists give us of the Saviour's prayers, we cannot say that the hour of prayer was the "still hour." A marvelous calmness characterizes him in what we would call the struggle of outward life; in the face of the tempter, on the storm-lashed sea, in the presence of the pressing crowd, when confronted with the hatred of bigotry. But in his prayers we are impressed with the sense of effort, struggle, and even of agony. Instances multiply. At the grave of Lazarus "groans" mingle with his prayer. After the visit of the Greeks his prayer is "troubled." In Gethsemane it was "agony." On the cross his cry was almost at the point of despair. Even on Hermon and in the upper room we do not feel the spell of that unutterable calm that fills his being when in the strife of the outer world. The inspired writer tells us that in the days of his flesh he "offered up prayers . . . with strong crying and tears."

The last element of prevailing prayer we will name is Faith, which requires but a brief paragraph, for it is implied in all the others. It is not a single color of the spectrum, but, including them all, is the one white light. "What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." It was once my privilege to hear Dr. Pierson speak on Prayer, and, as nearly as I can remember, he said: "The apostle piles up a sevenfold affirmation: First, God is able to do. Second, what I ask. Third, what I think. Fourth, all I ask or think. Fifth, above all I ask or think. Sixth, abundantly above all I ask or think. Seventh, exceeding abundantly above all I ask or think." Mountain piled above mountain as when the giants essayed to scale the heavens. And yet that wonderful statement is qualified by one little phrase: "According to the power that worketh in you." What is that power but your faith? "According to your faith be it unto you."

*A.H. Tuttle*

## ART. V.—ALL YE ARE BRETHREN

*An Open Letter to all Christians and all Christian Churches from the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church.*

PROMPTED by sundry public declarations recently addressed to us by various Christian bodies in the United States, Great Britain, and various countries of continental Europe and Asia, relative to Christian fraternity in interecclesiastical relations, or in some cases to proposed consolidations of churches or parts of churches, and believing that in different parts of the world many true Christians and Christian communions are at present hindered in the cultivation and exhibition of the fraternal spirit by grave misapprehensions touching the whole subject of church unity and church multiformity, as also, in some cases, touching the attitude of our own branch of the Church Universal toward other branches, we, the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in semi-annual Conference assembled, with an unfeigned desire to promote the glory of our divine Redeemer and the good of the whole spiritual kingdom of which he is the ever blessed head, herewith respectfully invite the attention of all Christians and of all Christian communions, therein expressly including the officers and members of our own Church throughout the world, to the following declarations:

I. The Christian communion which we represent firmly believes that the development of the mustard tree of Christ's kingdom into its great and widespread modern branches was a part of the divine purpose in its planting, and that this progressive ramification is intimately, if not necessarily, related to the accomplishment of the divine destination of the Church of Christ to reach and bless all classes and kindreds and tribes of the widely ramified race of man.

While, therefore, we believe in the absolute and necessary unity of the Christian Church as respects her origin, nature, and end, we cannot fix upon our own or upon any other particular branch of the one living tree and claim that it is the one and only legitimate Church of Jesus Christ. In this respect we wholly,

and, as we suppose, unalterably, differ from the Papal communion and from all ecclesiastical organizations which, in claiming for themselves a like exclusive legitimacy, become imitators of that communion.

II. The Christian communion in whose name we speak believes that the best and only infallible proof of the legitimacy of any particular branch of the Christian Church is to be found in its currently proven adaptation and power to transmit and propagate that pentecostal spirit and life procured for the world in and through the Founder of the Church, the incarnate Son of God. True Churches, as really as true prophets, are to be known by their fruits. Moreover, every branch which beareth not fruit is certain, in God's good time, to be taken away. If, therefore, all the patriarchs of the Eastern Church, together with the primate of Rome, were to unite in recognizing the communion of which we have the oversight as the true Patriarchate of the New World, this action would contribute absolutely nothing toward constituting or continuing this body a legitimate branch of the one true Church. It would still remain a truth that the validity of the claim of our own or of any other ecclesiastical organization to such a title must be dependent on continually tested adaptation and proven power to renew men in the divine image.

III. It follows from the foregoing that, in our view, the natural disposition of every true branch of Christ's Church toward intercommunion and fraternal coöperation with other branches will be proportionate to the degree of divine life and saving efficiency which it may observe in their life, work, and worship. At the same time this interior elective affinity must not be permitted to become the sole factor in determining interecclesiastical relationships and activities. In the sphere of church life, as elsewhere in the divine economy, the high should assist the low, the young the old, the strong the weak, the rich the poor, the free the oppressed, the enlightened the ignorant. But all efforts to discharge this duty should ever be prompted by genuine Christian love, and should be free from every alloy of Pharisaism, sinful rivalry, and ambition. As far as practicable they should be made

in methods cordially approved and consented to by all the parties to be affected by them.

IV. In discussions upon the subject of church unity and church multiformity, much confusion of thought and language has prevailed. Many who at heart are seeking the same thing fail to understand each other, and as a natural consequence find themselves in a condition of partial estrangement. In our view, as already set forth, the progressive multiformity of the Christian Church is precisely as divine as is its initial, essential, and teleological unity. In this respect God's spiritual kingdom in man exactly resembles his floral or his faunal kingdom in nature. Each of his kingdoms is one, but each presents in living forms an almost limitless variety.

Not infrequently persons speak or write of the "organic unity" of the Church of Christ as now lost and as needing restoration. To this use of terms we are not prepared to assent without important qualifications. The one organic action by which the body of Christ, his Church on earth, is continually renewed and strengthened and developed is to-day precisely what it was at the beginning. Now, as then, it consists in discipling and baptizing and teaching according to the original apostolic commission. (Matt. 28. 19, 20.) Now, as then, there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; diversities of administration, but the same Lord; diversities of operations, but the same God working all in all. (1 Cor. 12. 4-6.) There are, it must be remembered, two kinds of organic unity. The one is the abiding unity of the roots, trunk, and branches of a living tree; the other is the transitory unity of the vitally united chemical elements by which at any particular moment that living tree is constituted. The first is a unity which subsists beneath and through all stages of the normal development of a living germ into its divinely purposed manifoldness of part and function; the second is a unity which results from the temporary union and assimilation of certain preëxisting constituents. Accurately speaking, therefore, the organic unity of the Church is one thing, and organic union of all contemporary Christian believers is an entirely different thing. The first is as permanent and indestructible as the Church of

God on earth; the second is as changing and transitional as the unity of a particular generation of men.

The organic unity often spoken of by advocates of the administrative or governmental consolidation of several different historically developed branches of the Church is neither the one nor the other. No incorporation or ingrowth of separate branches, even if living branches, can ever make a normal tree. The idea, as soon as clearly defined, is seen to be absurd. It springs from confused and superficial conceptions of the nature of the Christian Church. In its best sense such an organic unity, if fully attained, would be simply the result of a unification of all fruit-bearing branches in one fruit-bearing branch. The ideal of the Holy Catholic Church, unconsciously underlying the thought of such advocates, would appear to be a branchless reed—not a vast, wide-spreading, heaven-filling tree of life, with fruit and shade and healing for all the nations.

A better name for the solidarity in various degrees lacking among the several branches of Christ's Church is Fraternal Unity. (Matt. 23. 10; John 17. 21.) Where this exists in normal measure, there will be no sinful schisms, no unholy church ambitions, jealousies, or antagonisms of any sort. On the contrary, there will be mutual respect, affection coöperation, fellowship, union in every good word and work. To the cultivation of this fraternal unity in Christian love and labor we affectionately invite all fellow disciples to whom these words may come.

V. As in all God's living works, so in his Church, there are fixed laws and limitations of life and of life's development. No tree was ever seen capable of limitless self-differentiation into branches. There is no danger that the divinely fed instinct for Christian work in congenial and adapted forms of organization will resolve the Church of Christ into an ever-multiplying and ever-weakening chaos of religious sects. That instinct is constantly counterbalanced by another, also divinely fed and of even greater power—the instinct of brotherly love. Hence, wherever, in consequence of the gradual oblivion of old wrongs, or the disappearance of old errors, or the death of inveterate bigotries among historic Churches—or, again, in consequence of the uni-



fication of separate political jurisdictions, or the aggregation of Christians and of Christian converts belonging to different communions in new settlements—hearts and minds that belong together are brought into neighborly relations, the instinct of Christian affection will ever cause them to gravitate toward each other with incomputable force. The resulting forms of organized Christian life will be new, and different from any before them; but, being the timely creation of that indwelling Spirit who has animated and formed and transformed the Church from the beginning, they will be as legitimately and truly historic as any that have gone before.

VI. Looking back into the history of our own Church, we are gratified to note the fraternal bearing initiated by the fathers at the beginning and since that time faithfully maintained; also, the responsiveness which that fraternal bearing has found in sister Churches. Partly by a most liberal policy of open communion and intercommunion, partly by official correspondence with other Churches, partly by receiving and sending fraternal delegates, partly—and perhaps more than in any other way—by laying stress at all times and in all places upon the essence, rather than the form, in all matters of church polity and function, this Church has sought to promote the growth of Christian fraternity in interecclesiastical relations. And with good success. Since 1820 there has been but one of our quadrennial General Conferences at which fraternal delegates from sister Churches in foreign lands and in our own land were not present with loving messages. Among these venerated and beloved servants of Christ have been eminent sons of British America, England, Ireland, France, Italy; men of African and of Caucasian race; advocates of Calvinistic and of Arminian theologies; representatives of Episcopal, Presbyterian, Baptist, Congregational, and other ideas and administrations. We can but think that the direct and reflex influences of these delegations, and of those which we have sent in response, have contributed to create the new day that has dawned on Christendom, and to a far greater extent than the delegates themselves, or even their respective Churches, were aware. Certain it is that no other Church of the same magnitude, and experiencing the

same constant pressure from increasing and multiplying home interests, has ever paid an equal amount of attention to sister Churches or received from them an equal amount in return.

VII. A few months ago a commission officially representing the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States addressed to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church about to meet in New York certain fraternal overtures looking to the organization of a new and all-inclusive Episcopal Church for the United States, and inviting brotherly conference with reference thereto, in the following terms:

We, Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in Council assembled as Bishops of the Church of God, do hereby solemnly declare to all whom it may concern, and especially to our fellow Christians of the different communions in this land, who in their several spheres have contended for the religion of Christ:

1. Our earnest desire that the Saviour's prayer, that we all may be one, may in its deepest and truest sense be speedily fulfilled.

2. That we believe that all who have been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, are members of the Holy Catholic Church.

3. That in all things of human ordering or human choice relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this Church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own.

4. That this Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather, coöperating with them on the basis of a common faith and order, to discontinue schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world. But, furthermore, we do hereby affirm that the Christian unity so earnestly desired by the memorialists can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first age of its existence, which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and his apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal good of all men. As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and, therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to wit:

(I.) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed word of God.

(II.) The Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

(III.) The two sacraments—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unflinching use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by him.

(IV.) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church.

Furthermore, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorized response to this declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass.

The General Conference received and considered the communication in the kindest spirit, and at length adopted the following response:

The Declaration of the House of Bishops, and the concurrent resolution adopted by the House of Bishops and the House of Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church, sent to us by the hands of the Rev. H. C. Duncan, Secretary of the Commission appointed by the Convention of that Church upon the subject of the Organic Unity of the Church, have been carefully considered.

We gratefully accept these communications as furnishing evidence of the increasing spirit of Christian fraternity which characterizes this age.

The Methodist Episcopal Church has always extended a cordial hand to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and is ready to co-operate in any movement which contemplates brotherhood among all branches of the Church of Christ. The organic unity of the Church may not be practicable at this time, and there are many thoughtful Christians who doubt whether it would be advisable if it were possible. But that all branches of the Church should dwell together in peace and labor together in love no sincere Christian doubts.

Imbued with this exalted Christian sentiment, the Methodist Episcopal Church will not erect her theory of church government into a barrier against Christian fraternity and church unification. God has honored all branches of his Church, and has thus taught the world that the spirit of the Gospel is of more consequence than any theory of church government; therefore,

*Resolved*, 1. That we are ready to fraternize and coöperate with the Protestant Episcopal Church, as we are with all other Churches of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to extend to it, and accept from it, all Christian courtesies which are common and proper among servants of our common Lord.

2. That we recommend the appointment of a Commission of three persons, namely, one Bishop, one member of an Annual Conference, and

one layman, who shall hold themselves ready "to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church," or the increase of Christian and church fraternity; and that this Commission be requested to make a report to the General Conference.

In the cordial fraternal sentiments thus expressed by the General Conference we, the presiding officers of the body, heartily and explicitly concur.

In accordance with the recommendation of the second resolution we have appointed as a Commission on the subject the following: Bishop Edward G. Andrews, D.D., LL.D.; The Rev. William F. Warren, D.D., LL.D.; The Honorable George G. Reynolds, LL.D.; and their names are hereby publicly and officially announced.

As to the overtures themselves, we must be allowed to say that we are by no means certain that we fully understand their meaning.

We could wish for more explicit information upon at least the following points:

First, the exact nature of the "organic unity of the Church" whose restoration is sought. The phrase, as we have seen, is ambiguous, and in this document neither of its two most natural meanings seems to be intended.

Second, the exact nature of the "schism" which the promulgators of the overtures seek to "discontinue." Among whom is this schism to be found? This point seems to us the more obscure from the fact that in the same document all duly baptized persons are acknowledged to be "members of the Holy Catholic Church." Moreover, we suppose this Holy Catholic Church to be the one of which it is said that to it Christ and his apostles committed that "substantial deposit of faith and order" which is "incapable of compromise or surrender," and which in the same sentence is declared to be identical with those "principles of unity" from which, impliedly, "all Christian communions" have departed, and to which they must all "return" before the desired Christian unity can possibly be realized.

Third, the essential marks or characteristics of the "historic episcopate," as this term is used in the declaration. This seems

important from the fact that the greater part of those particularly addressed, namely, the American members of the Holy Catholic Church, have never seen a bishop of any kind, while many of them have received their ideas of the historic type from such injurious and misleading representations as the following from the pen of the pious English poet, William Cowper:

Behold your Bishop: well he plays his part,  
Christian in name, and infidel in heart,  
Ghostly in office, earthly in his plan,  
A slave at court, elsewhere a lady's man,  
Dumb, as a senator, and, as a priest,  
A piece of mere church-furniture at best.

Under such circumstances it is evident that no one can reasonably expect to win over the American Churches of the non-Episcopal order to the acceptance of any historic episcopate without first explaining to them in clearest language precisely what the proposed episcopate essentially is, and precisely wherein the historic episcopate is distinguished from the pre-historic. Even the Churches of the Episcopal order, of which there are several besides our own, are entitled to the same information.

But while we thus miss much that we would gladly find in the Declaration of the Protestant Episcopal Bishops, we rejoice in that spirit of fraternity, that longing for larger and more catholic fellowship, which the document evidently breathes. However difficult our newly appointed Commission may find it to agree with inquirers that the "organic" unity of the Church of Christ can be present in one generation and absent in another—now taken away, and now restored—we sincerely hope that they will give the kindest and most patient attention to all who may be seeking for light in the interests of brotherly love.

VIII. Passing to Great Britain, we find a variety of fresh discussions and movements touching directly and indirectly the general question of Christian fraternity in interecclesiastical relations.

Last summer, under the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, an extraordinary, that is to say, an extra-canonical Conference of the Bishops of the Church of England, together

with those of her colonial dependencies and a number of those of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, was for some weeks in session in the Lambeth Palace. One of the most important of the questions considered was the terms on which the Church of England could consistently negotiate with the dissenting home Churches with respect to ecclesiastical consolidation, and with foreign Churches, especially the Eastern, the Scandinavian, and the Old Catholic, with respect to intercommunion.

Connected with this question a number of facts of marked significance confronted the Conference.

1. The fact that the Anglican Church, though once in relations of fraternal intercourse, and at least partial intercommunion with the Churches of a large part of Continental Europe, is now one of the most isolated of all the great Churches of Christendom, being in fraternal relations with but one independent ecclesiastical body in all the world, to wit, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

2. The fact that—by adopting the Lutheran and Early Anglican view of church polity, or simply joining with her own best "Broad Churchmen" in declaring that the question of the most scriptural and effective form of organization, no less than the question respecting the most desirable ceremonies of Christian worship, should be left to the godly judgment and Christian liberty of each organizing body—the Anglican Church could at any moment establish the heartiest of fraternal relations with every considerable Christian body in the whole Protestant world.

3. The fact that if—while still holding to the indispensable-ness of the Episcopal form of government—the Anglican Church would but pronounce in favor of that view of the episcopate maintained by many of her own profoundest and most scholarly divines, according to which all essential functions of the Christian Bishop are readily susceptible of combination with, or of separation from, the functions of the Christian presbyter—according to providential circumstances in locally adapting church supervision in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his



Church—even then she would at a single stroke open the way for cordial intercommunion between herself and every dissenting communion ever excluded or otherwise separated from her, with the possible exception of the Close-Communion Baptists.

4. The fact that the above-mentioned view of the episcopate—which renders needless the unchurching of all Christian bodies not organized under Bishops thrice ordained, by Bishops themselves thrice ordained, in unbroken succession from the days of the apostles—has found in the oldest of those Episcopally organized Churches which look with reverent affection to the venerable Church of England as their common mother, its highest illustration and most complete embodiment; and under this episcopate this eldest daughter of the English Church has, by the blessing of God, in a little more than a hundred years raised up a larger communicant membership in good and regular standing than is that of the parent organization.<sup>1</sup>

The results of the deliberations of the Conference upon the facts of the situation were embodied in an Encyclical letter to all Christians and in a lengthy series of resolutions appended thereto. With respect to intercommunion with foreign Churches, no new overtures were brought forward, but on the subject of home reunion the following resolution was adopted:

That in the opinion of this Conference the following articles supply a basis on which approach may be, by God's blessing, made toward home reunion: (1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith. (2) The Apostles' Creed, as the baptismal symbol; and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith. (3) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by him. (4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his Church.

It will at once be seen that the terms laid down are, with slight modification, those already formulated by the Bishops of

<sup>1</sup>The latest procurable statement of the whole number of communicants in the Church of England showed a total of 1,670,000.—*The Church Times*, London, 1887, page 213. The same authority remarks: "None but communicants have a real right to be considered members in good standing." The communicants of the Methodist Episcopal Church the same year were 2,093,935.

the Protestant Episcopal Church. Unfortunately, there is no modification in the fourth which, as interpreted by the authors, erects an impassable bar against every communion to which the paper is particularly addressed, with the possible exception of the Reformed Episcopal Church of England, a body already in such relations to the Established Church as to need no new barriers to keep it at a distance.

To the public protest of the Lord Bishop of Liverpool against the Encyclical, and to the criticisms published by such eminent lay representatives of the courts of the Church as Lord Grimthorpe, we have no occasion and no disposition to speak. We allude to them in passing solely for the reason that an omission of every reference to them in this place would be liable to leave upon the mind of many readers an incomplete, and to some extent unfair, impression respecting the actual state of public sentiment in the comprehensive Church for which the Conference, with more or less of propriety, assumed to speak.

One passage in the Encyclical indicates a certain progress. In speaking of the Anglican standards; and especially of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Bishops, without expressly mentioning the position taken by the first organizers of our Church, cordially approve of it, and commend its adoption in future cases of like kind. They say: "A certain liberty of treatment must be extended to the cases of native and growing Churches in which it would be unreasonable to impose, as conditions of communion, the whole of the Thirty-nine Articles, colored as they are in language and form by the peculiar circumstances under which they are drawn up." This makes it probable that the Anglican Episcopate has come to look upon the felicitous abbreviation of the English articles found in the Twenty-five Articles of the Methodist Episcopal Church with a more friendly eye than did their predecessors of a hundred years ago.

The foregoing citation also suggests the fact that the resemblances between the Church of England and our own Church are very numerous, and of deep interest to every student of interecclesiastical relationships. For example, the one body is

the foremost Christian communion in the Old World branch of the English-speaking race; the other the foremost in the New World branch. Each is centered in the heart of the morally dominant nation of its hemisphere. Each includes foreign dependencies of almost world-wide extent. Each, by favor of divine Providence, has an exceptionally influential relation to Christendom, with responsibilities equally exceptional. Each is episcopally organized and is strongly attached to its form of government. Their respective articles of religion are largely identical. In the same ancient and hallowed words they baptize their candidates, adult and infant, marry the betrothed, and bury the dead. In the use of the same liturgy they administer the Supper of the Lord, ordain their deacons and elders, and consecrate their Bishops. As an independent organization, each is, in an important sense, the daughter of an older communion, and each is disowned by its mother.

Important contrasts, too, are not wanting. The younger of these Churches is an independent, self-governing corporation, the other has never been; in the one the supreme authority is civil, in the other it is strictly ecclesiastical; the one was separated from its parent body in the sixteenth century; the other arose in the eighteenth; the one views itself as preëminently a Church of the past; the other regards itself as preëminently a Church of the future; the one is exceptionally full of differing theologies and church ideals, the other exceptionally uniform in both; the one gives prominence to stately and beautiful worship, the other to inward and active holiness; the one has its strength in the richer and more privileged social classes, the other has chosen to become the mother of rich and privileged classes by being a Church of the common people. Finally, the one bars its pulpit to Christian ministers of every differing name; the other welcomes to chancel and altar and pulpit accredited ministers of every Church in which the incarnate Redeemer is worshiped and a life in the Spirit of Holiness lived.

Surveying such facts, it is hard to say which should more powerfully move the two Churches toward a genuinely fraternal relationship, their likenesses or their contrasts. Both the former

and the latter afford constraining reasons why each should seek the welfare of the other, and by faithfulness in brotherly speech and action hasten to remove all remnants of early misunderstanding.

We close our too brief reference to this noteworthy Encyclical by acknowledging with peculiar pleasure the Christian salutations which it brings. In response we cordially tender to its authors our most respectful and brotherly greeting. In the name of all for whom we are entitled to speak we assure them that we reciprocate their loving solicitude, and that for ourselves—as for all fellow Christians—we accept the solemn truth so appropriately and so seriously applied to themselves by the members of the Lambeth Conference, to wit: “Our responsibilities do not end with our own people, or with the mission field alone, but extend to all Churches of God.” Our own type of churchmanship is broad enough to welcome to intercommunion devout believers in so-called “apostolic succession,” as well as those who reject it; we expect and respectfully await the time when the loved and honored Church of England will attain a like catholicity.

IX. In Germany, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and Sweden; in episcopal, consistorial, and similar deliverances; in the resolutions of synods and pastoral conferences, not to mention official ecclesiastical journals, many public declarations have from time to time been promulgated relative to our Church, and to its relations to the Churches established by the State. Of the unjust character of many of those put forth in earlier years we have no desire to speak; rather would we hasten to say whatever a feeling of genuine Christian fraternity can suggest in palliation of them. In the beginning, when both the authorities and members of the Established Churches were ignorant of our history and character and aims, and when the prevailing impressions respecting our Church were derived from unfriendly sources, it was but natural that fraternal recognition should be but slowly and cautiously extended, and that the manifestations of the spirit of interecclesiastical fellowship should be but rarely witnessed. Happily, a better day has come, and with improved

acquaintance improved relationships have been established. In various branches of the Evangelical Alliance, in societies for the promotion of moral and religious reforms, and in other associations of a social, literary, educational, or patriotic character, our ministers are finding a steadily increasing appreciation and our people constantly multiplying opportunities. As their chief pastors we earnestly exhort both ministers and people to continue to avoid everything which can discourage the living and working members of the older Churches, and to seek in every suitable way to strengthen them in their difficult position. Reciprocity cannot fail to follow. The providential course of events will hasten and perfect it. In proportion as the truly evangelical element in the State Churches is taught by events, the perils imminent to the true faith in case of an early disestablishment, and, on the other hand, their own inevitable oppressions and hamperings in Christian service in case an early disestablishment shall fail to come, in the same proportion will they be prepared to welcome Christian coöperation, and to join in that generous aspiration of Wesley: "I desire a league, offensive and defensive, with every soldier of Jesus Christ."

X. In Italy, not long since, an officially commissioned monsignor sought and was granted interviews with the superintendent of our missions, and proposed terms of union with the Roman Catholic Church of Italy. These, as the terms of the Papal Church invariably do, involved a surrender of our evangelical standpoint with respect to the great questions between historic Protestantism and Romanism, and hence were unacceptable.

With respect to the evangelical bodies at work in that newly emancipated and unified kingdom, we rejoice in their progress and in the blessings which they have helped to bring to a noble, but long neglected, people. In the newly formed Young Men's Christian Associations of Italy, and in similar organizations for Christian service and fellowship, our missionaries and pastors are happy to meet their brethren of other names. At our Annual Conferences, too, their representatives will ever find a warm fraternal welcome. Already it is evident that a new Italian



Christianity is taking the place of the old, and that the new is to be one far richer in spiritual quality, more varied in ecclesiastical expression, more catholic in interecclesiastical fellowship, more alive with the Spirit of life.

In Mexico and the several republics of South America, the relations existing between our Churches and those of other origin and form are much the same as in Italy—that is to say, the Papal priesthood steadily antagonizes them with ability and zeal, while all other Christian bodies rejoice in our presence and in our prosperity. Upon all of them may the blessing of Heaven continually and increasingly rest.

XI. In Bulgaria we stand on the threshold of the ancient Orient, and must needs define our attitude with respect to the Oriental Churches and to Oriental Christianity. We do so when we say that, in proportion as the Churches of the Greek rite maintain their historic opposition to the ever-increasing assumptions of the Roman pontiff, and their critical attitude toward the unfortunate original Erastianism and Socianism and Calvinism of the reformed Churches of the sixteenth century, and especially in proportion as they awake to newness of spiritual life, and to an active sense of their duty to Christ and to all men, in like measure do they approach the views of church life and church duty which we historically have aimed to represent, and thus approach the sphere of our heartiest fraternal sympathy. In time—may the Lord cause it to be soon—we hope that here, too, the watchmen may see eye to eye, and that fraternal relations of the deepest and most fruitful sort may be established between oldest East and newest West.

XII. In Africa, India, and Malaysia all Christian communions stand in a common relation to the established and historic heathenisms of the people, and accordingly are drawn into all the closer fraternal relations with each other. We group these fields together for the reason that our official relation to them as General Superintendents is somewhat different from that in which we stand to any other parts or provinces of our widespread work. Coördinate with us in jurisdiction over these vast portions of the earth stand two men exceptionally related to ecumenical Christen-



dom—our beloved associates, William Taylor and James M. Thoburn, the one Missionary Bishop of Africa, the other Missionary Bishop of India and Malaysia. Each has been an inspiration to communions other than their own, and each is attended by the prayers and Godspeeds of those communions.

The history of our missions in all these fields presents characteristics which are of interest in the present discussion. In no parts of the heathen world has our missionary work been so liberally assisted by pecuniary contributions from Christians of other folds. In no other have so many ministers and lay-workers from other folds asked to enter, and after trial been received into, our service. In no other have we given our sister Churches so extensive an illustration of the variety of our evangelistic methods or so effective an exhibition of our appreciation of the missionary service of woman. We have aimed to strengthen each Christian body in whose neighborhood we have labored, and in fields first occupied by ourselves we have heartily welcomed later comers. We are not without confidence that Christian fraternity in those ancient continents is yet to react with blessed effect upon many of the Churches of America and Europe.

XIII. In the Empire of China the relation of our Church to the other evangelical communions has always been most friendly. In the holding of general and special Mission Conferences, in the production of useful works upon the language, in the efforts to create a Christian literature, in the founding of Christian schools, and in many other ways, our brethren have ever been glad to coöperate with all who, like themselves, are trying to hasten the ultimate triumph of the Redeemer's kingdom. To the authorities of all the Christian bodies related to us in that land we respectfully tender the cordial greetings and good wishes of most friendly fellow laborers in the Lord.

XIV. In Japan recent events have afforded a significant illustration of the readiness of our Church to coöperate with sister Churches, and to lead in such coöperation even when it would involve an immediate cession of valued territory, the surrender of a large membership, and the loss of imperial opportunities. The same General Conference which, last May, assured the

Protestant Episcopal Convention that the Methodist Episcopal Church would not "erect her theory of Church government into a barrier against Christian fraternity and Church unification" was tested as to its sincerity in that statement. Our missionaries in Japan, together with the pastors and churches under our care, believing that the progress of Japanese evangelization would be accelerated in case corporate unity and administrative autonomy could be secured to all Christians of Methodist antecedents in the empire, petitioned our General Conference for permission to unite with their brethren of the other Missions in organizing a self-governing Methodist Church for Japan, independent of the control of any of the parent bodies, though in relations of cordial intercommunion and coöperating in evangelistic work. After a careful and protracted consideration of all the interests involved, the General Conference granted the permission sought, and upon the exact terms desired by the petitioners. In case, therefore, the other Churches concerned shall follow our example, and the proposed consolidation is effected, it will appear in history that toward the end of the nineteenth century six different Churches in various parts of the Christian world, by their own free acts, respectively ceded to a new native Church of alien tongue and race, along with rich and continued pecuniary gifts, all acquired rights to occupy the territory of a magnificent empire, and all claims to exercise jurisdiction over the schools and colleges and churches which they themselves had founded. A Church born of such coöperation and of such unselfishness would deserve—as we cannot doubt it would receive—the manifest blessing of Heaven.

In the foregoing paragraphs we have aimed to present appropriate fraternal responses to declarations, overtures, and acts of deep interest to the whole Christian world. Earnestly and prayerfully have we sought to speak sound words, words promotive of truth and love. We desire no reader to ascribe to them any other authority than that to which in his own judgment he may think them entitled. We have chosen to style the communication an "Open Letter," and have addressed it to the Christian public. Should the Christian public prefer to call it an

Encyclical, it will neither offend nor please us by so doing. An Encyclical letter is simply an ecclesiastical circular, and an open letter addressed to all Christians and to all Christian Churches is neither better nor worse for being so called.

Before concluding we desire to address a word of affectionate counsel and appeal to the presiding elders, presbyters, and deacons of that particular Church to whose supervision for a few swift years the Lord of all the Churches has been pleased to call us.

To you, brethren beloved, we look for nobler manifestations of catholicity and of ecclesiastical fraternity than the world has been wont to see. You represent a Church which more than any other embodies in free and home-grown form the forward-looking religious forces of that mighty nation to which all other nations are bringing contributions. And just as certainly as American civilization is destined to be richer and more cosmopolitan than any preceding type, so certain is it that in comprehensiveness, in variety of form, and in catholicity of spirit, American Christianity is destined to surpass all older forms, national or free, hierarchical or anti-hierarchical. Already, as often as you lead our public worship, you do so from a book of praise wherein all Christian Churches and all Christian ages harmoniously unite. As to doctrine, you have studied theology with Athanasius, anthropology with Augustine, justification with Luther, sanctification with Wesley. As to fellowship, your Church is in origin and essence Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic; in administration, Episcopal; in legislation, Presbyterian; in sustentation, Congregational; in the discipline of members, as also in the licensing of ministers, Independent. How unique, how vitally inclusive, how apparently final, seems such an embodiment of the Church Universal! Its very structure is preclusive of the partisan spirit, its life is a day school of true catholicity.

To the honor and responsibility of a participation in the instruction and administration of this foremost free Church of all history, you, brethren, are divinely called. Strive to be worthy of so lofty a vocation. Interests infinitely precious to the heart of Christ are to-day represented by the patriarchs of the

Greek rite, by the pontiff of Rome, by the Moravian bishops and Waldensian elders, by the consistories and courts of the Continental Churches, by the archbishops and convocations of Canterbury and York, by the general councils and synods and conferences of the various American Churches. As servants of Christ you are bound to give attention to these interests, to study them, to understand them, to promote them in every fraternal and Christian way. We are glad to know that you are attempting this, and that more, perhaps, than any equally numerous body of Christ's ministers on earth, you are accomplishing it. Still, we covet for you the honor and blessedness of doing it with ever clearer consciousness and with ever greater effect. Closer and ever closer grow the world-encompassing interecclesiastical relations into which the great Head of the Church is steadily conducting you. Though you dwell in all the continents, and belong to many races, and speak a multitude of differing tongues, you have in this respect a common calling. Nay, rather *because* you dwell in all the continents, and *because* you belong to many races, and *because* you speak a multitude of differing tongues, you have in a preëminent sense this calling to world-wide manifestations of brotherly affection, to world-wide coöperations with all true Churches of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

In the light of your connections with the aggregate of Christ's interests how inspiring becomes each duty in detail! In every effort you may put forth for the conversion of the Mohammedan world you are helping to deliver your brethren of the Oriental and North African Churches from the oppressions and benightments of a thousand years. Whenever, in any part of the world you place in the hands of a people the open Bible, you benefit by that act each Christian nation, Oriental, Papal, or Protestant. As often as you remove a single misunderstanding hitherto existing between Christian believers, so often do you heighten ecumenical harmony. Whenever, in any land, you succeed in winning one sinful soul from death to life, you not only give occasion for joy in heaven, but also justify a joy on all the earth. You hereby set in the on-going life of the Church Universal a beneficent factor absolutely new—a factor whose

possible significance for all coming generations no man has power to forecast.

Who shall exhibit to the world the breadth, the vital scope, the large-heartedness of Christianity if not you and such as you? Preaching from the heart the universality of God's moral law, the universality of human sinfulness, the universality of God's pitying love, the universality of the atonement by Jesus Christ, the universality of the ministries of the Spirit, the universality of the gospel invitation, the universality of the Church's commission, and finally the universality of Christ's ultimate lordship, you, of all men, must hold yourselves to the duty of perpetually contemplating the world-field in its wholeness, the Church in its unity. It may answer for national Churches to be national, and for dissenting Churches to be dissenting, and for an ultramontane Church to be ultramontane; but "it shall not be so among you." Your Church is not national, nor yet dissenting, nor yet ultramontane. The world is your parish, the great commission your charter, the Lord Christ your Patron.

"Therefore, let no man glory in men: for all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."

"Finally, brethren, farewell. Be perfect, be of good comfort, be of one mind, live in peace; and the God of love and peace shall be with you."

Signed by order of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, this..... day of ..... year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-nine, in the city of New York, by

CYRUS D. FOSS, *Secretary*.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE.—In November, 1888, in semi-annual meeting assembled, the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, by vote, requested a member of the then newly appointed Commission on Fraternity to prepare a tentative manifesto on the subject of Christian Unity and the attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church thereto. In response he drafted the foregoing document. More than eight months the Board held the

question of its issuance under careful consideration. During this time, however, serious questions were raised as to the intentions of the General Conference in its prior action. In view of these questions, the Board at length, in November, 1889, adopted the following as their final action on the paper: "Resolved, that we, the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, present our hearty thanks to the Reverend William F. Warren, D.D., LL.D., for the able paper on the subject of Christian Union presented to this body, and request him to give it to the Church as an invaluable contribution to the literature of the subject; also, that we hereby express our regret that we do not feel at liberty to express ourselves as a Board on this important matter, especially because (in large part) the subject has been committed by the General Conference to a Commission already appointed."

In view of the increasingly keen public interest now apparent in the general question of Church Unity, and in the proposed "World Conference on Faith and Order," the author of the "Open Letter" of 1888 has been asked and, after conference with judicious friends, has consented to comply with the original request of the Bishops and to give the document to the Church. He does this in the earnest hope that, despite its original date, its facts and principles may still prove promotive of good understanding and of ideal personal and corporate interrelations among all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

*William F. Warren.*



## ART. VI.—METHODIST WINE SKINS

At the start the wine skins of Methodism were so ample and generous that few considered the possibility that the life they contained would ever press upon the forms in which the power was provisionally carried to the world. Amplitude was the characteristic of the skin, irresistibility that of the power. Other ecclesiastical skins might crack, did crack to bursting, but what change would the generous might of the new evangelism ever be called upon to suffer or invite or demand of its own vehicle? Was not Methodism so far ahead of narrow creeds as that it would always lead the procession? Let the long future look out for itself. No flux of history would ever characterize our march. Something like this way of thinking has marked the mental, and therefore the practical, attitude of our church from the beginning. And yet, to change the figure, we have caught up upon our own frontier. Faiths, creeds, and forms, now much changed, which we outran decades ago, seem to be hugging our flanks. Can it be that they have got the secret of our power? Or can it be that we were cradled in change and have been forgetting our own inheritance, our own peculiarity, our own power? Shall we prefer the rigidity of a crystal to the might of an engine? It is not forgotten that stability and flux have gone hand in hand from the foundation of the holy catholic church, and when the door opened for the fresh impetus of the eighteenth century revival that both of these forces, both of these proofs of divine right to rule and to order the forward march, were enthroned in the mind and heart of Wesley. In more than one item he resembled Paul. In both brains were the one man and the world. To save the man into whose eyes you gaze is one thing. To save the man who lives down the ages, the creature of another environment, a member of a changing social order, calls for new wine skins for the larger, the swelling life of truth, the same and yet different.

In the early church and in the founding of Methodism one may discover a striking parallel. It is worth while to pause a

moment to frame it in words that what follows may stand out in clearer reasonableness.

At its start the church was the residuary legatee of two giant ideas. She inherited from Greece individualism, from Rome she received universalism, and through the alchemy of Judaism she touched both to higher forms through the superlative worth of her Lord. "Christ was ultimate—as synonym of what is deepest in being and as synonym of what is final in History" (Nash). Jesus is the Master of history, secular and churchly, conscious and unconscious. The common man is ever in his eyes, also the most distant shore and the most unlike governments. The undermost and the outermost cannot be beyond the reach of the arms of his cross. There is a sweet legend in the Talmud to the effect that when the Messiah is found he shall be found at the gate of Rome, among the sick and wretched and outcast. So it was at the start: Man and Rome; Humanity and Empire. After a fashion the church has held to this double vision, now giving one side the emphasis, now the other, seldom holding in true poise both at once. The church was to be part of the civilization, changing as it went on, ever receiving the old gospel in new statements. We may speculate as we will, and wish it otherwise, but the fact is inescapable. Augustine was a pronounced individualist, but with prophetic eyes he substituted for the sway of the Roman empire the universalism of the "City of God." The Vandals might make a breach in the walls of Rome, but the City of his vision was impregnable. It was Gregory, in a later age, who was led by the sight of Saxon slaves in a Roman market to push his mission to England—that England whose vastest expansion would but give opportunity for faith to fling the gospel to the whole world. What people have so cherished the Bible, the chart of an endless voyage of discovery? At his coronation King George was given a Bible with these words: "Our gracious King, we present you with this Book, the most valuable thing that this world affords. Here is wisdom; this is the royal law; these are the lively oracles of God."

No one who knows of the gradual upcoming of the common man in the history of the English people can fairly question the significance of the power of democracy even though under the forms

of a yielding monarchy. Nor are democracy and empire antagonistic ideas. Toward both the world is slowly tending. Power has accommodated itself to changing manifestations at each lap of the long race. Both church and state have been swept onward as with inevitable omnipotence. In the whole field of onswEEPing forces true religion is accompanied by, if it does not create, new fountains of life. In the sixteenth century it was nationalized. In the seventeenth century it was puritanized. In the eighteenth century it was popularized. It proved to be a part of the general life of whose best it was holy patron. In the first-named period it joined hands with Romance and sang through Spenser's *Fairie Queen* ("Fairie" means "spiritual"). In the second it emerged from a jail and gave Bunyan to an unending fame, holding in hand the *Pilgrim's Progress*. In the third it inspired a mighty throng of sooty-faced colliers near Bristol to sing till the hills reëchoed while an Oxford-bred enthusiast preached until rough men became lambs and harsh women choiring angels. This was certainly new enough. The English world was facing a new path, or the old path bending out toward a fairer horizon. It was in the air of the new literature, especially the poetry of the last half of this century. After Pope, men like Cowper and Goldsmith turn to nature and to man with finer sympathy. Ballads, folk-lore, regained their hold on the popular mind and heart. A new son of poetry was born, "who walked in glory and in joy, following his plow along the mountainside." Burns was not an angel in morals, yet the sweep of the wing is in some of his lines. More than that, the human note, the man shaking himself from ancient bonds of creed and custom, beats in his lines. Cowper enters with his "Task," rightly styled the poem of Methodism, as "*Paradise Lost*" has been called the Epic of Puritanism. Goldwin Smith has characterized Cowper as "The apostle of feeling to a hard age; to an artificial age the apostle of nature. He opened beneath the arid surface of polished but soulless society a fountain of sentiment which had long ceased to flow." Into this mighty circle enter Wordsworth and Coleridge and the new day is at dawn. What is this but the larger tent cords of Wesley's "The world is my parish"? The hope of humanity scans

the most distant horizon of freedom. In Shelley's "Prometheus Unbound," the incarnation of the genius of humanity struggling to free himself from the tyranny of the evil powers of the world, is the story in verse of the raw, suffering giant of unchurched England of the eighteenth century, neglected, despised, rising at call of the evangelist to free himself from the thralls of his old life and to rise to share the full life of a better brotherhood of man. The most violent breaking of bonds in all history took place in France in the last quarter of Wesley's century. The most effectual and peaceful bond-breaking was that of Wesley, who taught the strong man that his might had been given him for service to God and his fellows. Once again a new kind of history began to be written, for a new kind of man was making it worthy to be written. History had come to have a new meaning. Historians ceased painting pictures merely and gave their strength to the solution of problems. "They sought," says Lecky, "rather to write a history of peoples than a history of kings." Not the ups and downs of dynasties, but the "moral current" of a people gives us the best horoscope of national life. So the makers and the writers of history, as well as the poets, were sitting by the side of the hearts and the homes of man to become surer prophets of a more glorious day. Only thus might men catch a true vision of the better world. This is worth looking into. It will be an awful error not to be able to discern the trend of this age, and in this field, and to know the relation of our host (ecclesiastical) to it. We got a tremendous impetus from great leadership, and we illustrated the power of great following before Wesley's first missionaries reached America. The lanes of London, the valleys of Wales, and the hamlets of Ireland sent out at Wesley's call their thousands who rallied with loving loyalty to the side of the Lincolnshire rector's son. Were they credulous? Yes. Ignorant? Yes. Sinners? Yes. But credulity took the stamp of the sanest faith, and the untutored minds took to books, and wicked men like Thomas Olivers went forth to write "The God of Abraham Praise." The dry bones quivered, breathed, rose up, and marched at call of the leader, going at great speed for the ends of the earth.

Not only into a new era for England was Methodism cast,

but supremely so into the land of her noblest triumphs, the continent in which the new governmental ideal was to have its most glorious illustration. Whatever the new democracy was to have for men the new religious order was to have for them also. The solid character of this prospect made its deep impression upon two great Englishmen. Hear Professor Seeley upon the far-carrying power of the Revolutionary War, out of whose throes the mighty republic was born: "What, then, is the true test of the historical importance of events? I say it is their pregnancy, or, in other words, the greatness of the consequences likely to flow from them." He then adds, "I do not risk anything by saying that the American Revolution is on an altogether higher level of importance than almost any other in modern English history."<sup>1</sup>

The great scholar then slips in the link needed for this discussion: "Religion is the great state-building principle." Another link is supplied by Mr. Gladstone. In 1889 he wrote, "I incline to think that the future of America is of greater importance to Christendom at large than that of any other country." Is it not worth our while to inquire whether the governmental ideal has not advanced faster than the ecclesiastical ideal? The Methodist Episcopal Church began closer to the common man than the Constitution of the United States. She grew faster relatively than the Union for many a decade. But of late she has slackened her pace. I have often wondered if the American republic has not welcomed more changes than the church which was present at the cradle of the government. In the former case the common man did not have a share in control, and was compelled to wait till far on in the coming century before he might enter into the heritage of the prophecy of the Declaration of Independence. In the latter it was a long time before laymen were allowed to have a share in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. Be this an open question, are we not compelled to ask whether, in the attitude of the government toward the rights and privileges of the common man, the civil power has not been, if not more liberal, yet at least a more inviting field for the unfolding of the powers of the common man? Is there here not an anomaly? The ballot box is a symbol,

<sup>1</sup>Expansion of England

the peculiar symbol, of democracy, its very altar. Can the same be said of many a church altar? The one has not professed unduly to magnify the brotherhood ideal which the other has for two thousand years inscribed upon her banners. Which is the guiltier of his brother's blood? Strong words are these of Dr. Nash: "A society that refuses to provide the lowest man with the opportunity for self-development and turns him into a thing, a means to another's self-development, is a compact with hell." The revolt of people against power has been history thus far. Man's upcoming has been all too slow. Agencies that were heralded to help have too frequently turned to broken reeds which pierced the hands that grasped them. Rights have been denied, responsibilities have been refused, and privileges have been withheld. Yet we have come on. It has been a long journey from the days of class rule until now, when men are demanding popular election of senators, and the initiative, and the referendum, and the recall, and kindred forms and powers for the expression of their mind and will. In the future there will arrive a democracy of which men have merely been dreaming. We are traveling toward a state of society and government and Christianity filled with a thousand surprises for the man whose mind is incapable of adaptation to new orders of things. We may regard democracy either as an intellectual or as a moral movement; intellectual, its aim is the diffusion of knowledge; moral, its aim is the securing of justice. It has already won vast triumphs in education, it is yet to win vast triumphs in righteousness. Government by the few must give way to government by the many, since selfish privilege stands revealed as utterly unworthy of the purer aims of humanity. So democracy is the eternal foe of monopoly, political, industrial, moral, educational, spiritual. It will not submit to any phase of slavery, to feudalism, to capitalism, to militarism, to churchism. Democracy is hostility to privilege. Up to the present day democracy has been almost entirely engaged in solving the problem of securing for men a just opportunity. This is a step only prophetic in character. It may be interpreted by those who have been helped up as meaning that the world has been waiting for them to appear so that they may suck its ripened juices



when the duty and privilege of putting the fruit to another's feverish lips is lost sight of. A man dare not take out more than he puts in. This was the curse of the bad old days along the Rhine, and, it may be, is to-day up and down Broadway or Euclid Avenue. It is plain that democracy can no more shun its duty than could any other form of power or than any form of power will ever be able to do. For power is peril. Deterioration will ensue when laws enable any man to take out of the general resources more than he puts in. Democracy will be under most awful bonds to organize the changing environment so as to guarantee progress. Is the church to stand on the shore of a boundless water and ask only, "Lord, what shall this man do?"

In his recent work, *Social Basis of Religion*, Professor Patten has a suggestive chapter upon the Social Mission of the Church. One does not have to agree with the author in all his argument in order to value highly some of his conclusions. In this chapter he holds that there are high points of resemblance between the condition of the Roman world at the time the church was started and our day. It is noteworthy that Ferrero, the great Italian writer, has taken the same ground. The likeness may not be as both these eminent writers contend, but that some sort of crisis is at our doors none can successfully deny. Patten holds that to-day civilization must be extended to other regions and races or else it will decline as it did at Rome. If new races cannot be raised to take the place of those who are being ill affected by prosperity with its corrupting effects, an inevitable decline will come. "If laborers remain outside the church, if immigrants are not assimilated into our national life, or if we fail to do for Africa and China and India what the early Christian missions did for our German ancestors, a slow but certain death awaits the church, no matter what may be its success in other fields." Methodism and modern democracy are wedded together in most undeniable fashion. The basal conception of the second is that of the first, the brotherhood of man. The aims, the positive genius of democracy are one with the generous life of the church. Never has the philosophy of Christianity found such a field as this one, splendidly "white to the harvest," one in which peoples unknown to each other are expressing their con-

scious and their instinctive life in word and work of limitless significance. When peril faces or poisons the life of the people the church is endangered. When sorry folk are led to see in the dreams of saints, in the ambition of the world's Saviour, their possibility of deliverance from the malarial character of the social order, they will come forth, the two together, the church and the world, their foreheads shining with the glory of the discovery of the ages.

If ever the church had a fair field it is now. It is great enough to grip great problems. It is, or should be, in its element. For when men are breaking away from shackles of all sorts is it not time for the saints to offer their solution, God's solution, for the pressing difficulty? The church is not, cannot be, most thoroughly quickened to its high call where caste and division and social ostracism dull the sense of humanitarian regard for the brother man. Nor must we think that the church goes about leveling down, for it is always set upon leveling up. Any other notion of its place and inspiration is rank unreason and does it gross discredit. Need we wonder that in America there came a glorious vision to our fathers, whether as the makers of a new nation or as the founders of a new impulse, for the spread of the holy faith of Jesus Christ? Even at the beginning of the strife it was found to be well to emphasize the values of brotherhood. What significance there was in the exile of the Tories from Boston. Not their tastes, their claims of class rights and class prides—not these were fit to lay at the bottom of the new nation. Trevelyan thus remarks upon that incident: "There are benighted parts of the world where injustice and oppression in cruel and practical forms have survived through the ages unassailed and unquestioned; but in a civilized and high-spirited community the far or near future never fails to exact retribution from those who have caught the trick of disdaining and disparaging the mass of their countrymen."

What a field we—I should say our fathers—entered without the gainsaying of any man, so open, so inviting, so promising of rare fruitage as this, the American continent, and this, the American republic! Nor can it be a bad guess, the reason why we grew so a hundred years ago, when we once found our pace. Why have we not kept it up? There may be more than one reason, but quite

surely this one is availing, that we have lost out in our progress somewhat of the animus for soul-saving, that brotherhood spirit with which our fathers were evidently inspired. Have we not been seduced by the growing tendency toward class division in which the whole nation has suffered the loss of certain of its ideals and inspirations? Has democracy been endangered from the vast separations which the congestions of wealth have brought in? Have both nation and church winked at the suppression of the poor man's rights, and refused, both in law and prayer, to take the case of the oppressed? Does any wonder why we have not grown much of late, or if we have not altogether stagnated, that we have not lifted aloft among the people the standard of an impartial, a brother's gospel? How far the two are connected I am not able to say. But it is not without reason that Professor Giddings said a few years ago before the Nineteenth Century Club: "We are witnessing to-day, perhaps not permanently, but at any rate the decay of republican institutions. No man in his right mind can deny it." 'Granted. Yet the hope is not lost that the ship will right itself—or, to take another figure, the pendulum will surely swing back, and in its return stroke both the common man and the child of God will see the coming in of the once gray and hazy kingdom now returned in shining splendor, radiant, attractive, and mighty. Democracy is in some phase the final goal of humanity, speaking politically. If this be past denial the church that declares its message is to all men, without regard to caste, condition, race or clime, the church which has for these long ages held in its prophetic eye the abolition of unjust discriminations, of unfair distribution of powers—the brotherhood of man—such a church must capture democracy by adjustment, by sympathy, by fellowship, by real and unfeigned share of its fullest life. How shall such a prospect be realized? Must we wait for it? Or may we hasten its coming? Will it involve change and readjustment? Have we the courage to enter in? Mayhap it will call for a brave heart. Have we been carrying water in wine skins?—and are the skins cracking? What is to do? These are questions of moment. What if there are those who protest against change? Has there not always been a stalwart throng of

carriers who have borne their leathern jars to the end of their day, even though warned by their fellows that the precious liquid was dripping from the used-up vehicles? So it has ever been. So it will continue to be. There is no occasion for undue alarm. Some will aver that in the army of carriers of Methodism this is not probable; that a breed of radicals who in other days stormed impossibilities will not furnish any record of stubborn conservatism. The only way out is to consult the records.

Who has objected to change?

When it was proposed to establish Methodist hospitals, not so many years ago, not a few voices were raised in warning that the proposition looked too much like Catholicism, and that it would be far better to use the force therein to be used in the holding of revivals. The altar of the church was set over against the cot of the sick ward. Now the beautiful humanitarianism in this Saviour-like step for the lessening of human pain and distress has only laudation in the universal Methodist mouth. When it was proposed to introduce the deaconess movement as a part of our humanitarian and spiritual progress, the same half-querulous and skeptic voice lifted itself in protest. I heard it, and so did you, if you recall the initiation of the blessed sisterhood—"Methodist nuns." Yet when now and then some bereft pastor has led to the altar of the church a lovely deaconess that charge has turned to ashes. When it was proposed to bring into closer bonds for fuller service the laymen of the church what an outcry blew up. Who that is now fifty years old does not recall the ominous skies that lifted themselves in the wordy exhalations of conservatives? When a loyal son of Methodism lifted his voice a few years ago in General Conference to render the report of a committee upon the proper attitude of the church to society, and invoke the support of Methodists in an effort to take the measure of certain drifts in the world of the social man, and mentioned sociology as worth the study of every Methodist preacher, an old "war horse" snorted his disgust and equine sense of the wastage of time and words by the younger brother. Yet that same brilliant committeeman is now on the episcopal bench.

Is it well to be specific? Why not? When one considers

that the great duty of the church is to express the truth to each new age we do not question the wisdom of the Moderator of the Presbyterian Assembly in saying at the Atlantic City auditorium, "Phrasing of faith may change, ought to change, with every age." This agrees with what Amiel wrote some years ago at Geneva: "It is the historical task of Christianity to assume, with every succeeding age, a fresh metamorphosis, and to be forever spiritualizing more and more her understanding of Christ." Is it possible for a man to stumble over the graves of other days? No doubt. Our dead may get in our way, and even cheat us of achieving the very dreams they dreamed when on earth. The gospel we preach hurries us on. It is a living gospel. In his Yale Lectures Forsythe declares "that a fixed and final system is therefore incompatible with the genius of the gospel. Living faith means growing power." To say that Methodism is a peculiar product of the ages and is not subject to the law of change is to prophesy its ultimate extinction. Its ancient good might well become uncouth. We have changed. We are changing. We will continue to change.

Some one asks, Does this mean that Methodism is subject to doctrinal change? With promptness the answer is made, Why not? Methodism is a flame, not a crystal. If Mr. Wesley had a right to change the old confession in order to give his young and fast expanding host less harness and more power, have we less discretion in a later age? How often in years past have we heard the proud boast that when the great tree of Methodism put forth branches it was never on account of differences in doctrine, but always on account of polity. So the notion that we had somehow started off with an unalterable creed which would be proof against the operation of the law of change became a sort of "fixed idea" in the Methodist pulpit and bred in our people a dogmatism not wholly sane, not wholly progressive, and our original power tended to become our later poison. If Mr. Wesley were at the head of our procession now, with what noble enthusiasm would he chide the fear of some and check the folly of others. He was more concerned about might for progress than about safety devices for moderating speed. He did not care preëminently for consistency, far less than for real power. A few essentials clearly held, even



passionately held, and then—forward! This is no new position. It is so full of the commonplace that one hesitates to give it room in a precious page. Yet it is worth recalling that, long years ago, Dr. Abel Stevens, in his matchless history of the Methodist Episcopal Church (Vol. 4, p. 500, to be exact), said, "With changes of time must come changes of policy, if not changes of what have been deemed fundamental opinions. Methodism has through most of its history been taking on new adaptations." In all of this I am not arousing half-baked young theologues to stand up in the pulpit and exploit the "new things" which their courses in the theological schools have introduced them to. It is not surprising that many of them fail to feed the people when the preacher is constantly mixing up the great essentials with some non-essentials. The pulpit is not the place in which to air metaphysics or to discuss unsettled speculations, or to exhibit a show of knowledge. It is evermore the home of mighty conviction, of noble passion, of resistless love.

In another field we are facing conclusions with a serious problem. Are we ethically consistent, and are we true interpreters of historic causes and cures of ills, and are we users of right methods of approach, when we descend from the good pedagogy of the Bible to the lumber wagon of multitudinous specifications of things forbidden, and their exaltation to notice in the Book of Discipline with the delusion that the church is somehow to be purified by the automatic operation of many specific rules? John Wesley was content with General Rules. We, with less power of appeal to conscience, pelt the erring church member with harmless threats of trial and excision. Who enforces the disciplinary provisions for securing a law-abiding membership? Not one in a thousand. In the mind of the writer a question has arisen with regard to the bearing of the time of the insertion of what is now ¶260 upon its character. The time was that of the close of the Civil War. The era was one of more or less of disorder, of a disturbed order in social and ethical and spiritual life as well as in the more obvious and overt phases of life. The Civil War, with its awful *sequelæ* of ills, of lowered ideals of personal conduct, and of the lapse of the stern sense of duty and of the positive loss of power for progress,



left the church not a little puzzled as to the best way to right itself. War is debasing enough, even though we came out of this one unified and free. During its continuance in many cases the ordinary discipline had been set aside. The greater duty had obscured the less. The war was a crowning illustration of the place of force in wiping out a nation's sore. Force is not careful of its touch, its main concern being to get a mighty hold. It too often substitutes bloodletting for brain drill and moral appeal. Of course no man can decide to what degree the church was affected by the atmosphere of which we are thinking, but is it not entirely credible that the champion of educational methods, of ethical appeals, of a loving spirit, of the call to conscience, was led astray from her old-time pedagogy and evangel to attempt the cure of ills after the manner of the harsh methods of force, so triumphant in one way, so futile in another? The police station never was, never will be, a school for character. It is true that its practices are swifter than those of the school or the church. To say, "Thou shalt not," is easier than to show one why he should not. The church took the easier way of attempting to cure the tendency of some of its members to find amusement in questionable fields. The problem of 1868 is ours to-day, and we assume a false attitude toward the problem by preserving a stiff impracticability of which we are the luckless heirs, a method of solving difficulties which failed once, is failing now, and will fail to the end.

Once more. As we have mentioned the freedom of faith and the freedom of conscience, a word may well be given to what may well be called the freedom of criticism. The writer is not about to take a dip into the deep waters of Biblical disputes. He is thinking of what Cavour said upon his dying bed, "Give us a free church in a free state." Let the cry now be with us, "A free press in a free church." One is compelled to ask questions: Are our editors expected to cultivate the fine art of taffy-pulling? Must they be compelled by the very atmosphere in which they live to keep an eye asquint toward General Conference? The writer of these lines is not to be misunderstood. He is trying to get light upon one of the principal puzzles in all our economy, but he cares more for loyalty than for uniformity, and he believes that the host

in the ranks has the same feeling. He is doing some thinking aloud, that is all. One of the oft-repeated criticisms of our great church is that it somehow breeds a tendency to officialism, nourishes it, and gives it disproportionate influence in pulpit and council and press, and even in the spirit of the rank and file of worshipers. Is not the press too official? Is not authority too pronounced? Is not immunity from fair-minded criticism too general a principle? If so, then there is but one conclusion: We have here a deadening draught which we are applying to the lips of our millions wherewith to still the welcome exhibitions of true loyalty and to substitute a more formal and interested method of praise of all that is called "Methodism." The very genius of loyalty is in its unforced and spontaneous character. Its heart is free to chide that which it loves. Officialism does not, cannot, evoke such a spirit as will make the coming Methodism equal to her highest call.

Summing up: Have our false consistency, our opiate momentum, our selfish power got us along with the King's business as fast as our fathers marched? Their rate of increase from 1800 to 1810 was 5 and 8 and 12 and 17 per cent per annum. We last year moved at the rate of less than 2 per cent. What shall we say? and what shall we do? If a stiff, unyielding consistency cannot bequeath the spirit of progress to another age, be nobly inconsistent. Pray for, cultivate, the life of spontaneity, in whose free-moving order is omnipotence. If the coming age is to be kept from damning narrowness it must be filled with the breath of the gospel which runs abreast of the latest mind of the new age. And how shall we enrich the new age with ideals and practices of unselfish power if we ourselves fatten our pride upon our success instead of hiring it out to divine service? It grows mightier only by use. What kind of children shall we have? Let us charm them with such a vision of glorious toil for others that they shall be able to outrun us in doing God's errands.



## ART. VII.—THE NATURE OF REVELATION

KNOWLEDGE has its beginning in a venture of faith. We do not come to faith through science, but to science through faith. We undertake to give reasons for our beliefs rather than to hold beliefs because of our reasons. Beliefs originate in the spiritual being of man; reasons issue from his mental being. The belief will have a birth uncaused by him; the reason will have a development through his conscious effort. The one is raw material, the other an attempt at a structure. "Any fact which gives knowledge," we are told, "is a revelation."<sup>1</sup> But we must be careful to interpret the word "give" in the sense of presenting the material out of which knowledge can be made. For knowledge does not come without effort on our part. There must be a conscious reaction of the mind against the material which is given us for thought. There can be no knowledge without a mind capable of receiving the revelation and fixing it as knowledge. What is given is really the impact of suggestion. What is received is the impulse to work out the suggestion. The working out will be partial and unsatisfactory. No man can fully express himself. There is always something back-lying. Knowledge is thus only an approximation. We see in part and cannot produce more than we see. But the part leads on irresistibly to the whole. Man projects the whole even although he feels he cannot realize it. He has a presentiment of the whole. He believes that somewhere, in some mind, truth is whole and comprehensive, so he makes a venture of his faith and progresses, as he believes, toward knowledge. He projects an infinite Mind. He sees—he feels—reality about him. He would lead this reality back to a primary and ultimate Reality. Reality in his mind pushes him back to the mind of Reality. He has, therefore, a stimulus for his faith. Vague and intangible though it may be, there is a force which stirs him to faith as surely as the wind bulges the sail. And he can guide his belief as the shipman can turn his prow. There are no paths before him, but he is no more on a trackless sea than the mariner. His faith is the star

<sup>1</sup> Henry Melvill Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*, vol. i, p. 5.

that leads him on. Now, what is the stimulus of his faith? Darwin was frequently asked for his religious opinions. He wrote many letters giving his views on fundamental questions. He was exceedingly cautious in all his statements.<sup>1</sup> But in one letter, at least, he committed himself to the very thing he was doubtful about. He is writing to a Dutch student in 1873. After referring to the extreme improbability of "this grand and wondrous universe, including our conscious selves," having arisen "through chance," and saying that "to a certain extent" he deferred "to the judgment of the many able men who have fully believed in God," he closes with the sentence: "The safest conclusion seems to me that the whole subject is beyond the scope of man's intellect; *but man can do his duty.*"<sup>2</sup>

Here, it would seem, is the real heart of the matter. What is man's duty? to whom is he duty bound? how is he able to do his duty? why does he want to do his duty?—these questions go deeper than man's intellect, into a realm superior to it. When the noted scientist said, "but man can do his duty," he gave evidence of a conviction not based on knowledge. This conviction, in spite of himself, led him to feel he was duty-bound, and to believe that he could fulfill the obligation. He felt instinctively a dependence, and that dependence was on a power beyond the scope of man's intellect. Even although he was "aware that, if we admit a first cause, the mind still craves to know whence it came and how it arose," yet something in him told him he was under obligation to something without him and that he ought so to conduct himself that his life would not be out of harmony with his something without. This is an experience many men have. In fact, it is of so frequent occurrence that we are warranted in saying it is an experience common to all men. Psychologists as well as religionists have studied this "something" and have found it is not without, but within; that it is an instinctive tendency which man de-

<sup>1</sup> "The habit of scientific research makes a man cautious in admitting evidence." Letter to a German student, 1879. *Life and Letters*, edited by his son, Francis Darwin, vol. i, p. 277.

<sup>2</sup> *Life and Letters*, vol. i, p. 276. The italics are ours. Compare this statement with the conclusion of Borden P. Bowne: "Technically, of course, our faith does not admit of demonstration; neither does any other faith or unfaith. But it does admit of being lived; and when it is lived our souls see that it is good, and we are satisfied that it is Divine." "Gains for Religious Thought in the Last Generation," *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1910, p. 893.

velops morally and philosophically. This tendency is described as the religious in man. It is the foundation of all religions. We are not here in the region of hypothesis, but in that of history. The records of historical research fix the fact that man, always and everywhere, has been moved by a tendency which sooner or later issued in religious belief. Whatever the theories as to the origin and cause of this religious tendency, the fact stubbornly remains that man innately or intuitively is religious. No philosophy has been able to create a religion; and no psychology has been able to find the phenomena of the religious elsewhere except in man. It is not an outward influence, but an inward energy. Man does not acquire it, he is born with it. The center and circumference of religion and of religious instinct man has found in the Being whom, with the consensus of the world's opinion, we call God. Such a fact as this should lead thoughtful men to consider not, Is there a God? but, How are we to think of God? The tendency, of course, is to think of him in human terms, and we are quite apt then to create him in our own image. To impart to him the characteristics and attributes of man is to make him a tenuous abstraction. Hence Haeckel's scoff at Deity as a "gaseous vertebrate." But can we think differently of God? "Anthropomorphism in some degree is inevitable, because each man must think in terms of his own experience. Into his own personal universe all that he knows must come."<sup>1</sup> Science must speak of nature in human terms just as well as philosophy must think of God in human terms. There is no term the scientist can use which is not a formula of the human mind. The terms force and cause applied to nature and the ongoing of things are just as much derived from human experience as the terms mind and heart applied to God. "Modify them as you may, all causal conceptions are born from within, as reflections or reductions of our personal, animal, or physical activity: and the severest science is, in this sense, just as anthropomorphic as the most ideal theology."<sup>2</sup> And yet we are told that the idea of God cannot be anthropomorphic and appeal to

<sup>1</sup> David Starr Jordan, *Stability of Truth*, p. 163.

<sup>2</sup> Martineau, *A Study of Religion*, vol. i, p. 336. For a number of quotations on anthropomorphism see Note 2 to Lecture I, Illingworth, *Personality, Human and Divine*, pp. 219-222. See also George A. Gordon, *The Christ of Today*, p. 86, and *The New Epoch for Faith*, p. 265.



the thoughtful man. Thinking of a crude anthropomorphism that would attach to the Divine Being the limitations of human kind, we of course could not defend it. But may we not move out from the idea of God imaged in the form of man to the idea of God thought of essentially as spirit like man? Can we not say that, as the real man is spirit, the real God also must be? Of course Jesus has told us that God is a spirit. But he added, they who worship him can worship him only in spirit. We know nothing of spirit except human spirit. Indeed, we can be sure in our knowledge of only a very little of this. But the spirit of man we do know has sufficient marks and characteristics to lead us to believe that it must have a likeness to another Spirit from which it derives its power and in which it finds its fullness. If the ancients, or even our fathers, were guilty of thinking about God in a crude anthropomorphism, this is no reason why we should stop thinking about God in the only way and with the only means we can think of him. Our task is to purify our thought; to bring our ideas of God into perfect harmony with the best we have been able to realize in human life and the highest ideals we feel we may aspire to.

When man thinks of anything really worth while he thinks of something noble rather than base; something high rather than low. There is a spiritual impulse which pushes him upward. He has dim ideas of a great unknown where life is richer, purer, better, more real. A heaven is projected and a Lord of all. This Lord of all must be good, he must be holy, he must be loving. Hence he must be a self, a personality, and he must have relations to those who aspire to reach or know him. This is a crude thought of God. But it is the thought of countless intelligent people. They are not able to formulate their thought according to the rules of logic. They are hard put to it to give a reason for their belief in God. But they do believe in him; and, what is vastly of more consequence, they live, or want to live, as though he existed. They are not very far removed, after all, from the scientist who also could not formulate a satisfactory reason for the existence of God, but who nevertheless said, "man can do his duty." Men want to be in right relations to the being whom they call God. And this fact, as stubborn a fact as we find in the whole



human realm, gives warrant, if not validity, for the presuppositions, crude as some of them are, for the existence of God.

Now we cannot think of God apart from personality. Although much vagueness, and even doubt, exists as to the meaning of the term,<sup>1</sup> we need not lose ourselves here in abstractions. "The principle of personality is a positive and fertile principle." It is "one of the most fertile principles which has ever been able to establish itself."<sup>2</sup> We sense its meaning because we cannot understand anything except through the medium of the thinking, feeling, willing self.<sup>3</sup> This is personality. The soul of nature means nothing if we can think of nature only on the basis of mechanism with no personal directing power. The soul of man is nothing but a term if it begins and ends in itself and has no relation to other souls or to the one Soul. Men trust nature, else they would not till the ground and sow; they trust men, else they would not venture on social or business relations; they trust God, else they could not hold to the trustworthiness of nature and man. Such words as trust, trustworthiness, imply personality, and the very heart of the implication has a moral reference and significance. The moral relation implies activity actuated not only by moral motives, but for moral ends. Hence a moral universe and a community of human beings who can be moral. Hence, also, a communion between God and man, a giving and a receiving, an asking and an answering. In the very nature of things, therefore, God not only must reveal himself to men, but must give himself in all worthiness and dignity to man. It is impossible for man to hold anything good to himself and for himself. In spite of his naturally selfish disposition, in order really to derive benefit from his possession he must share it with others. A thought can mean nothing to us unless we impart it to others. This must be true even of God. So the goodness of God is meaningless unless man, through God's

<sup>1</sup> "Whatever the power be that sustains the world, we cannot conceive it to be a person even if we knew what a person meant." G. Lowe Dickinson, "Knowledge and Faith," *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1908, p. 521.

<sup>2</sup> Harold Höffding, *The Philosophy of Religion*, pp. 315, 316. See also the most instructive discussion of the whole subject by John Wright Buckham, *Personality and the Christian Ideal*.

<sup>3</sup> "The self itself as the subject of the mental life and knowing and experiencing itself as living, and as one and the same throughout its changing experiences, is the surest item of knowledge we possess." Borden P. Bowne, *Personalism*, p. 88.

volition, can share in it. "One thing, and only one, we can safely say God *must* do: He must act according to his own nature."<sup>1</sup> If we believe that God is good, that he holds moral relations to man as well as to the universe, of which man is a part, we must hold that God is under obligation to make that goodness and that moral relation known to man so that man can benefit therefrom. As man thus becomes the object of the revelation, it is valid to assume that God will adapt himself to man. Living matter is "educable" matter.<sup>2</sup> "It is matter selected and put into a course of training; it will profit by experience."<sup>3</sup> If this is true of living matter in the lower forms, it surely must be true of living matter in the highest form. Unless man is an end in himself he is subject to training. In the lower stages of his development we know he must undergo a process of training. This does not end when he reaches maturity. As he finds unoccupied fields in all ranges of knowledge he would like to possess, so also is he conscious of his inability to possess them. He would profit by experience. He gives himself to study in new realms even when, like Cato, he has reached the age of fourscore. Always and ever he hears voices declaring there is much still to be said to him, but he is not able yet to bear it. Finality nowhere has been reached. The things we see clearly lead us only to the edge of darkness whose depth we cannot determine. Our little candle makes the night more real. But we push on. What light we have penetrates the gloom; we can see our way and in some places can touch the current that floods our standing place with light. Gradually, gropingly, man advances. If he were not drawn onward he would stop in his tracks. But, like the Explorer,<sup>4</sup> he hears a voice ringing

. . . interminable changes

On one everlasting whisper day and night repeated—so:

"Something hidden. Go and find it. Go and look behind the Ranges—  
Something lost behind the Ranges. Lost, and waiting for you. Go!"

Gradually and progressively, man has moved. He has received revelation not as though there were only so much of it and

<sup>1</sup>Gwatkin, *The Knowledge of God*, vol. i, p. 135.

<sup>2</sup>Nathaniel S. Shaler, *The Individual*, pp. 22f.

<sup>3</sup>Newman Smyth, *Through Science to Faith*, p. 19.

<sup>4</sup>Rudyard Kipling, "The Explorer," *Collected Verse*, p. 19.

it was handed out bit by bit until all was gone, but as though each bit was part of an inexhaustible store and was a little more complex and comprehensive than the last. In our own human efforts at education we labor gradually and progressively, adapting the lesson to the learner. We cannot believe that God, in his education of man, would use any less carefully thought-out and serviceable methods. We cannot conceive of him being haphazard where man exercises choice, or unmindful of an end where man, so far as his intelligence and experience go, takes each step with a definite purpose in view. If man must work according to the rule that two and two make four, and that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts, God must work in the same way. For he is dealing, not with his equals, but with finite men, who cannot find themselves in chaos, but must be led by rule into order. Difficulties, of course, will arise. They will not inhere in the revelation, however, but grow out of man's unpreparedness. A simple axiom in geometry will puzzle a pupil in the primary grade but ought not to present any difficulties to a high-school student. Revelation will not settle all intellectual difficulties for some men, nor will it settle some intellectual difficulties for all men. If it did, it would not be revelation and there could be no intellectual endeavor. In general, revelation will be intellectually clearing, because in essence it will be simple and adapted to its subject. Revelation, therefore, will not be limited to a particular time nor adapted only to a certain people. It will be received in time by particular individuals, but its scope must be timeless and extra-individual. The word of God to the first thinking man must have the same meaning to the thinking man of to-day. The thinker to-day will get more out of it, not because there was less revelation for the first thinker, but because the thinker of to-day can appropriate more of it than his earlier brother could. He takes revelation not only through the experience of the race, but through a larger range of subjects and purposes in the light of which revelation is to be interpreted. Man has heard God's voice at divers times and in various ways. The revelation, as we understand it, always has had reference to the progress of the race and the disposition of man to receive it.

But as we assume God to be one and unchangeable, so must we regard his truth. In this sense his revelation has been full and complete, man's knowledge of it partial and received by defined stages. A fullness of time must come for man before he can see through the further purposes of God which existed from the beginning. And we must assume that God will use certain means of leading man to see his truth. But we cannot suppose that with God, as with men, truth grows. He is the truth. In ways best known to him he gives himself so that man can appropriate more and more of him. In no wise could he limit himself to a particular time or to a particular way of revealing himself. Such a question as the revelation of God to so-called heathen peoples cannot arise when we consider that, from the beginning, God has been revealing himself. We find his presence in the literature and the life of peoples who lived ages before the patriarchs of the Old Testament. And we need not be surprised when the literature of such peoples shows a deep insight into the being and purpose of God. For, if God loves his children, we must assume that he has loved them from the very beginning, and not that he permitted the race to begin and grow for a long period of years before he turned his kindly countenance upon it and reached down his arms to take it into a loving embrace. God revealed himself long before the first child of Israel was born. Nay, we must even go further and say that God was in the act of making ready for his revelation before any son of man was born. We read that "the heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork." Man discovered this fact. As he contemplated it he was lost in wonder and praise. But he only discovered the fact. He did not make it. The fact existed long before he was born, and shows God's evident purpose in revealing himself to man. He left his mark upon the rocks in the hills, on the stars in the heavens, upon the waters of the deep, all for the purpose of making himself known to man. Revelation, with man as its object, will also be moral and livable. We may say it will be ethical, and not metaphysical. It will have to do with the practical and not the theoretical phases of life. We cannot see or know the sun except as we have certain indications concerning it. Men believe it exists and that it gives light and heat; but the sun itself

we cannot know. So, metaphysically speaking, we cannot know God. He does not reveal his actual self to us. But men believe he exists. As they live by appropriating the light and heat of the sun, so do they think they find life in God by living the truth which they believe he reveals. This faith has a satisfying content. Men know error is not livable. They base their actions on what they know to be true and dependable, even although they have a very little amount of truth. As this tendency of man finds its cause in God, we assume that God's impartation of himself is moral and ethical. Men take it to be so, and feed upon him, and the result of their nourishment is a healthy, full, red-blooded life. This means soundness and sanity. It also means not only a desire to be good, but a large amount of goodness actually achieved. If the truth of God in its expression to man has a spiritualizing effect, we can dispense with the formal rules of logic in trying to ascertain his nature. We can look at the countless lives which have fed on this belief of his moral and ethical nature and have assurance of the kind of Being he must be. We can regard metaphysics as the theory of God's being and ethics as the fact thereof. The one would be theoretical, the other practical. Only the moral and ethical revelation of God would be livable; and if man could not live the truth of God, it would have no value for anyone but God. The idea of God shut up to his own truth is unthinkable.

Revelation is the unfolding of God to man. It has meaning for man only as he makes effort to understand it. It is adapted to man's capacities. On the God side it is timeless, universal, moral; on the man side it is gradual, progressive, livable.

*Wm. W. G. H.*

## ART. VIII.—DEMOCRACY AND DISTRESS

DEMOCRACY, like man, "partly is and wholly hopes to be." Democracy hopes for equality of opportunity, industrial as well as political, for enriched life in all the people, and to make them partners in the substantial benefits of advancing civilization. This is an ever-progressing ideal behind which every nation lags.

Our industrial system is still essentially feudalistic. Comparatively few men own and direct the machinery of production, exchange, and distribution upon which the economic welfare of the people depends. Here in America, with the wealth of a magnificent continent reserved for centuries, there has been a scramble of individuals and corporations to grab as much as possible for themselves, wholly irrespective of the bearing of such acts upon the well-being of the people as a whole. Even the power of the state, which should safeguard the common welfare, has been subservient to individual and corporate greed. We have been making money so fast in this country, and so many persons, especially in our periods of prosperity, have enjoyed such a comfortable living, that we have been blind to the increasing social wreckage which our go-as-you-please way of doing things has entailed. The widening abyss of poverty among us is a tremendous indictment against what we term progress. The race as a whole is progressing. In the long struggle that humanity has been making to subdue this earth and get a living, the main body of the army has won many significant victories and entered into a promised land flowing with plenty, but "the three ragged regiments—the badly employed, the unemployed, and the unemployable," as Brierly calls them—have been left hopelessly in the rear; they have become entangled in their own misery and assailed on every side by those inveterate enemies, pauperism, drink, and lust.

The degradation of the slums is dreadful beyond the power of man to estimate, but it is not so terrible as that bitter feeling rankling in the heart of thousands that there is something wrong in the constitution of society in which a few live like princes and



many like beasts. "The submerged tenth" do not always reason correctly, but they see these frightful contrasts between wealth and want, their imaginations are inflamed, and they are goaded by hunger to resentful feelings which are a constant menace to society.

These discontented masses are all the more dangerous because they are partly right in their contention. The very growth of the city, the increase of population, has added to their burden. Land increases in value, rents are advanced, and, as a consequence, the poor, who have to live near their places of employment, are crowded into smaller quarters and are obliged to pay more for what they have. Nor is this all of a poor man's burden in a growing city. The increasing population increases the demand for the means of subsistence, but the owners of land and natural resources find in this demand an opportunity for constantly higher charges upon the productive ability of the community. This makes harder the struggle for a living. It touches us all, but it grinds upon the poor and incompetent. This is the modern Fate, the Sphinx that stands squarely across the path of humanity in all our cities. We shall have to guess its riddle or be swallowed by it.

We have drawn from our ruling economics the flattering unctiousness that in pursuing one's own interests one best subserves the welfare of the whole. Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, which is the Bible of economic individualism, has been supposed to sanction this principle of conduct. But Adam Smith never taught that ethical and altruistic considerations should be excluded from the industrial realm. He always recognized that economic activities should be subordinated to conscience and justice in determining human action. He distinctly said, "Every man, so long as he does not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interests in his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man or orders of men." Justice had a higher place in Adam Smith's thought than wealth. He was a professor of moral philosophy, and his *Wealth of Nations* was a side issue. In that treatise he gives many examples of conflict between private interests and the public good. He steadily insists that the state take

care that the contestants in the industrial arena play fair and do not trample on one another's rights.

These were the two great essentials of economic welfare in the mind of Smith: Liberty to seek one's own interest without hindrance from any man or body of men, and Justice, standing guard to protect the rights of all. Liberty and Justice were ever married in his thought; these twain were regarded as one flesh. But unfortunately man put them asunder very early in the capitalistic stage of industry. Self-interest degenerated into covetousness, divorced itself from ethical guidance and control, and industrial anarchy has been rampant ever since. The evils of divorce in families are frightful, but the enormities arising out of this divorce between the power to get and the duty to respect the rights of others, together with the unholy alliances between big business and politics, smell to heaven and call down the indignations of God and man.

The American people have nothing against big business. We must have big business and industrial efficiency or fall behind as a nation. But big business must play fair; it must not by the might of monopoly or legislative interference tackle its competitors low down, maim them, and put them out of the running. That is gladiatorial, not industrial, competition.

The immediate remedy is to arrest the offenders, not to threaten in such a vague way as to restrain trade in general. Make the punishment personal, and such as fits the crime; make it imprisonment or forfeiture of charter, as England and Germany do, and not a fine which the people, the consumers, will have to pay. The *cure* lies deeper. Chronic social diseases are not cured by surgery. But if big business here were as much separated from politics as it is in England and Germany, even, we should suffer very much less from its extortion. There can be no equal industrial opportunity so long as legislation is dictated by contributors to party campaign funds. Behind all this controversy concerning the trusts are two political parties, like racehorses, scoring for position. The interests will back their favorites, the people will applaud the winner, and "the invisible government" by and for privilege will still rule.

The alliances between business and politics have demoralized society to an extent that we little realize. Say what you will in favor of a protective tariff—and a few things can still be said—but the tariff, in the partisan, corrupt way in which it has been administered, has debauched the conscience of the nation. Individuals, corporations, whole states, indeed, have sought their selfish interests first and been stolidly indifferent, if not openly hostile, to the general good. Graft has grown enormously and scattered the microbes of corruption so far and wide that American society has become even more infected by it than it was with slavery years ago. In the middle of the last century, during the Corn Law agitation, Mr. Fairbairn, the father of Principal Fairbairn, was asked to sign a bill favoring landowners. To the surprise of his neighbors, he refused. "Why not sign it?" they asked. "It will increase the value of your land." "I will not increase the value of my land at the cost of another man's bread," he nobly replied. This suggests a similar statement made by Walt Whitman: "I will accept nothing which all may not have their counterpart of on the same terms." If such moral stalwarts were multiplied among us, the supports of democracy would be far stronger; our industrial life would not be so chaotic and thrown into panic by every political agitation.

There is a growing conviction that this economic burden, under which all work in getting a living, must be shifted in some way so as to make it easier for the mass of the people. It will be shifted. The burden will not be placed where capital would like to put it, nor where labor demands that it be put. No one can predict with any certainty just what adjustment will be made, but one very important step will be the lining up of all friends of humanity for a compulsory minimum living wage for labor, a wage sufficient for every workman to lead a self-respecting life and maintain his industrial efficiency. This has become a burning issue in England and Germany and it will be here in America. A national minimum wage has been established in Australia for ten years and it is working well. Germany has made many long strides in this direction and has in successful operation a score of regulations which are wonderfully conserving the efficiency and

vitality of the workers. The Imperial Minister of the Interior, speaking in the Reichstag, said: "If Germany has experienced a vast industrial expansion, equaled by no other country in the world during the same time, it is chiefly due to the efficiency of its workers. But this efficiency must have suffered had we not secured to our working classes by the social legislation of recent years a tolerable standard of life, and had we not, as far as possible, guaranteed them physical health."

There may never be found in this world a perfectly just system of remuneration. Justice has its throne where the majestic Hooker said the seat of law is—"in the bosom of God." Justice gains a residence in human hearts and in society only in proportion to the moral development of men; only in proportion as they "do justice, love mercy, and walk humbly before their God." "As an eagle broodeth over her nest, feeding her young ones from her own beak," teaching them to fly by bearing them on her own wings, so the God of justice broods over our callow humanity, stimulating the consciences of men and impressing upon them his rule of perfect conduct. Through all the mingled wrong and right of these competitive struggles runs the invisible, binding force of God's increasing purpose to establish just relations between men.

The social problem is more moral and religious than it is political and economic. There is no method or system of distribution, not even the socialistic, that grasping men could not manipulate so as to get more than their just share. The struggle is not so much between capital and labor, or between capitalism and socialism, as it is between greed and good will. These forces are not confined between the lines of cleavage made by any economic distinctions. They contend for the mastery within labor unions as truly as within corporations. Every class in society is crying out for its rights and is more or less selfish in its demands. These antagonistic demands can never be polarized and harmonized by any regulative enactment, governmental or socialistic, without the coöperation of certain unifying, transforming emotions and duties. Nothing can impart these with such fullness and power as the religion of Jesus Christ. In his dear,

uniting love humanity stands heart to heart. All rights and all possessions are beheld coming down from God, the Infinite Giver, "by whom are all things and for whom are all things." This belief has always been in the bosom of humanity, especially in its instinctive feelings and judgments, but Christ has given it its most effective expression and sovereign efficacy. Wherever Christ has sway, power and property rights yield to the common good. Luxury looks odious in the presence of moaning want. Green, in his *History of the English People*, has described how this feeling of social responsibility has risen superior to class interests and brought substantial gifts to the masses. In 1815, for example, "oppression, corruption, and injustice were omnipresent and apparently impregnable. The aristocracy, the officers of the nation and of the municipalities, the owners of estates, gave the law to England, and the idea of sharing their powers and rewards with the common people never entered their minds. Nor would they ever have admitted it had the appeal been simply on the ground of abstract right, for popular government seemed to them the same as anarchy. But the abuses resulted in national calamities which affected the rich as well as the poor, and slowly, against their will and fighting for every step, the upper classes conceded point after point to the proletariat. The social amelioration which Green describes as beginning in 1815 was carried through the entire century. John Morley declares that the championship by Bright and Cobden of the people against the colossal forms of selfishness had about it "something of the apostolic." "Those two plain men, who became orators because they had something to say, left their homes and their business and went over the land to convert the nation as to a new religion." Christianity to-day would be much more apostolic if the various churches did not expend the most of their energies in caring for their ecclesiastical preserves, coddling the well-to-do and trying to keep them from being lost, rather than in seeking that "great multitude who are scattered abroad like sheep having no shepherd." These receive only a few crumbs of service after all other interests are served, just as Lazarus did from the rich man's table. Some day they may be comforted and we tormented. God is not



blessing this self-centered propaganda. The returns from our present denominational investments and activities are scarcely respectable. Furthermore, churches are becoming cheapened and compromised by huckstering methods to raise money for current expenses.

We are crying out for disarmament among the nations to avert the horrors of war and to lighten the burdens which are crushing out the lives of the people. There is a still greater necessity for us to stop this ruinous denominational competition and enlist our churches in a holy crusade to uplift these abandoned masses upon whose salvation the very well-being and prosperity of society depend. We little realize the power of the dangerous forces at work outside our present church ministrations. During that great strike in England last summer the crisis was so threatening that the London Times declared, "We are assisting at an absolute disintegration of society into its elements." Lord Churchill said that if the strike had continued a week longer there would have been a cessation of industry; had it continued two weeks, there would have been widespread starvation and a slaughter of the innocents more terrible than that under Herod. Such outbreaks are always imminent so long as the present bitter unrest prevails. The bond which more than any other holds society together is the good will expressed by the community in humane legislation and the various forms of helpfulness. Luther said, "Accept the civil situation and may God mend all." "Nay," replied Calvin, "we must help him mend all." In like manner John Wesley declared, "We are the servants of the community. We are in the communal life to redeem it by service, and by any and all service that we can render." Would that we had to-day men of practical sagacity and organizing power like Wesley to mobilize our churches for the moral and spiritual betterment of those to whom Christ, if he were on the earth to-day, would minister first of all! What a transformation there would be in church enterprises and methods if, like him, we put first things first! Every denomination in every city has unproductive property which might be converted into circulating capital; and if one third of the money and energy now employed in maintaining churches among



those who have every gospel and social privilege were devoted to reaching in a determined, friendly way those whom Christ would call the "lost," the Christian Church would go forward by leaps and bounds. Class struggles would lose their bitterness and many of the running sores of pauperism and crime would be healed.

The strength and glory of the Christian Church in the early centuries came largely from the neglected proletariat. This was also true in the German and Wesleyan Reformations. The church always advances or retrogrades in proportion as she goes to or away from the people. She lost ground terribly when, in the days of the Factory Acts legislation, she did not support Lord Shaftesbury in his humane work. Despite the awful burdens under which the laboring classes, even children of tender years, were groaning, Shaftesbury writes sadly, "In very few instances did any mill owner appear upon the platform with me; in still fewer the ministers of any religious denomination." How different the attitude of the working classes toward Christianity would be if the Christian Church in general had been as zealous and effective in helping them fight their battles as her militant saints, Kingsley, Maurice, and others!

Every lover of humanity should rejoice in the noble ideals and sacrificial zeal of many socialists in behalf of a better social order. As Schäffle, in Germany, writing simply as an observer, says, "A spirit of noble endeavor, an idealism which often shames the well-to-do classes, a devotion approximating martyrdom, characterizes many an agitator of the social democracy." Such is Socialism in its best estate. But the Christian Church cannot afford to relinquish her God-appointed leadership in any movement that concerns the betterment of society. The Bishop of Hereford, standing in his place among the British Peers in the Parliament, the other day said: "If the Bishops have any function to perform, it is to speak for the multitudinous poor. . . . Never again shall the fundamental liberties of the people be endangered by a privileged class." If the Bishops of every name should exercise such a leadership, what a rallying to their support there would be! That would be a superintendency which would

make Methodists glad, indeed. Any Methodist Bishop might well afford to sacrifice the bird's-eye view gained by "traveling through the whole connection" if he became, like Cardinal Manning, a friend of the friendless and a conservator of social order in a single great city.

Joseph Lincoln Steffens once asked a ward boss how often he would go to the front for a follower detected in crime. "I'd go once for the kids' sake," was the reply. "Wouldn't you go twice?" "No— Well, I might." "Now wouldn't you go three times?" "O, go away. There's got to be some fellow in every ward that any fellow can go to when he needs help, hasn't there?" Boss rule sometimes exercises a determined friendliness that the Christian Church might well emulate. "Some fellow in every ward that any fellow can go to when he needs help!" This is what the church should supply in a much better and holier measure than any boss can.

The most conspicuous manifestation of the kingdom of God in our age is this ever-broadening, aggressive movement known as democracy. It is changing the ideals and activities of men; it is pulsing with the warmth and vigor of consecrated lives. This outpouring of the very soul of humanity seeking for the fullest realization and expression is sweeping away principalities and powers—all obstructions, in fact, to equality of opportunity in the broadest sense for every man, woman, and child. This movement is religious and ethical; it is political and economic; but, whatever its form or name, it has a definite direction and a predestined goal. Everywhere and always its end is the kingdom of God democratically organized to serve the common good. The church must ally herself with this democratic movement and help direct it or fall hopelessly behind. The church needs the large aim and expansive activities in behalf of humanity which such an alliance and ministration would give. Her doctrines of the Divine Fatherhood and Christ's atoning love glow with new meaning and are clothed with tremendous persuasive power whenever men and women are lifted out of the horrible pit and miry clay of the slums and established in respectable, holy living. We little realize the inexhaustible spiritual wealth before us in this field of our common

human nature. When every member of society has the chance to use his God-given powers to the utmost, when there are no weltering masses of abandoned humanity, but all are brought under the discipline of gracious opportunity, when all the hungry animalisms are subdued and everything that wastes and desecrates man's precious substance of character is done away, then we shall see Jesus as the Prince of Peace, with the government upon his shoulder, in the noontide of his glory, and fulfilling the aspirations voiced by the Puritan poet:

Come forth out of thy royal chambers,  
O Prince of all the kings of the earth,  
Put on the visible robes of thy Imperial Majesty,  
Take up that unlimited scepter which thy Almighty Father  
Hath bequeathed thee, for now the voice of thy bride  
Calls thee and all creatures sigh to be renewed.

*Daniel Dorchester Jr.*

ART. IX.—ROMANTIC TENDENCIES IN THE WORK OF  
ALLAN RAMSAY

CANTY ALLAN has always seemed to me the shadow of a rock in a weary land; not a gigantic rock, it is true, nor with a far-reaching shade, but I have known hot noonday on a treeless road where the shadows of the telegraph poles were eagerly welcomed.

Let us frankly admit at the outset that Allan Ramsay, like Percy, Thomas Warton, and other eighteenth-century writers whose works influenced the later Romantic movement, was sometimes classical in theory and conventional in form. When writing in "Sassenach" he never hesitated to affect the regularity of his revered friend and correspondent, "Sandy" Pope, as he called him; while throughout his fresher, more notable Scotch verse there are a sanity and balance which we too often miss from more thoroughly Romantic writing. A page of Ramsay, after too long absorption in the pseudo-classical production, is as refreshing as a sea breeze in August. If we are not content merely to enjoy this new note in literature, and will insist on studying his poems in order to learn wherein he differs from his contemporaries, we are impressed first by Ramsay's homely, direct, specific diction, different from the published poetry of the day not only in dialect, but also in the very nature of the words used. Next, we note that, far from affecting the cosmopolitanism then fashionable, this Scotchman absolutely parades, and even protrudes upon our notice, a warm, proud love for his native home. Consequently we are not surprised to discover presently that Allan is constantly quoting, imitating, and sometimes publishing entire the ballads and folk-songs of his dead and dying ancestors from the Hills. Finally, our curiosity growing somewhat subtle, we become convinced that in Ramsay's treatment of the realm of nature a new note is being struck. Such, I take it, is the order in which we are impressed by certain tendencies commonly accepted as Romantic—a sequence convenient to observe in the present discussion of Ramsay's work, especially as this same order, strikingly enough, is that in which these points came into prominence as the poet's works ap-

peared. Such Romantic tendencies, then, to which we devote particular attention, are visible in (1) his diction; (2) his patriotic enthusiasm for Scotland's past; (3) his love of ballads; and finally (4) in his feeling for nature.

Those philosophers whose long ears could not endure specific, popular names of things, the Buffons who allowed to literature only broadly generalized terms, must have found Ramsay vexatious—if they read him, indeed. He never shunned the distinctive word, though that word were unknown to the gentleman and were dear, it may be, to the highland peasant. In one of his early poems, "Tartana" (1716), written in large part with humorous conventionality, referring to what the pseudo-classicist would have styled "Caledonia's picturesque garb," he boldly calls it the "plaid," and cries:

Look back some thousand years, till records fall  
And lose themselves in some romantic tale.  
We'll find our godlike fathers nobly scorned  
To be with any other dress adorned.  
May she be cursed to starve in frogland fens,  
To wear a fala ragged at both the ends;  
May all this fall, and more than I have said,  
Upon that wench who disregards the plaid.

This is specific enough, and in more than one way Romantic. But for the most part we may disregard Ramsay's attempts at Popeian English verse—work informed with genial humor but seldom remarkable or to our purpose here.

From the time when he enters the Easy Club, a convivial association of Edinburgh's mildly literary spirits, Ramsay shows a growing fondness for the vernacular in verse and for freer meters than the orthodox heroic stanza. His first especially significant work dates from 1716-18. Somehow he ran across the now famous Bannatyne manuscript of old Scots poems, a storehouse of words no longer current save on the trembling lips of the beggars and old women, whom Allan loved no less truly, though less sentimentally, than did Wordsworth. In this collection Chrysts-Kirke on the Grene caught his fancy, and in 1716 he published it in broadside. The quaint verses took amazingly, and soon a second canto followed, and a third. This last was also in old orthography, and

full of obsolescent Scotch, but was in fact the work of Allan himself. The diction is nothing if not coarse, vigorous, picturesque, and highly specific. Sark-tails, hurdies, kail, brachan, bannocks, and the like, are not very classical, but are enlivening after an overdose of Pope. In broadsheets, and presently in *The Evergreen*, these cantos went all over Scotland and England, being pirated and legitimately reprinted times without number, as was the fate of most of Ramsay's publications. From now on Ramsay breaks at will the classical laws of diction and devotes himself untrammelled to the romantic life of "a cauld Scottish bard."

Wi' brose and bannocks puirly fed,  
In hoden gray right harshly clad,  
Skelping ower frozen hacks wi' pingle,  
Picking up peets to beet the ingle.

To appreciate fully the fine flavor of his diction one must contrast the countless cold, forgotten translations of Horace with Ramsay's paraphrase of the Ninth Ode, Romantically specific from the start:

Look up to Pentland's towering tap,  
Buried beneath big wreaths of snaw,  
Ower ilka cleugh, ilk scar, and slap,

etc

Be sure ye dinna quat the grip  
Of ilka joy when ye are young,  
Before auld age your vitals nip,  
And lay ye twafauld ower a rung.

Sometimes Ramsay actually imitates the speech of the man in the street, even to a degree of coarseness never found in the lines of that other poet who boasted of being colloquial in verse, Wordsworth. Allan's elegies, character-sketches, and humorous sallies are as definite and full of local color as is the work of Burns, and, in truth, largely inspired the later poet, as Burns repeatedly testifies. The elegy on Patie Birnie is worthy of the Ayrshire plowman himself. It tells of the old fiddler of Kinghorn:

How first he practis'd ye sall hear:  
The harn pan of an umquhile mare  
He strung, and strak sowns saft and clear  
    Out o' the pow,  
Which fir'd his saul and gart his ear  
    Wi' gladness glow.



Or this of the miser, who has never been better drawn in all the classic pictures of him:

Some loo the court, some loo the kirks,  
Some loo to keep their skins frae lirks,  
Some loo to woo beneath the birks  
Their lemans bonny;  
For me, I took them a' for stirks  
That loo'd na money.

Into his satiric poetry Ramsay introduces a highly characteristic mixture of classical and popular diction, achieving thereby quaintness and true humor, as in *Wealth*, or *The Woody*:

Like Nilus swelling frae his unkend head,  
Frae bank to brae owerflows ilk rig and mead,

and again:

Where now like gods they rule each wealthy jaw,  
Whilst you may thump your pows against the wa'.

It is needless to point out other instances of Ramsay's avoiding the large general term when he is concerned with a local particular thing. *The Gentle Shepherd* is a mine of examples, but that poem so much occupies our attention in another connection that we pass it over here. Certainly a poet who dares mention "a strae-hatted lass," or a "sheeve of cheese," and a "hankering swither" has shaken off the shackles of the poetic diction of that Augustan age. That Ramsay chose his heterodoxy deliberately appears from his reply to a rival bard, who, alarmed at the growing favor accorded Allan's "rustic jargon," as he phrased it, called upon true Britons to

Leave Ramsay's clan to follow their own ways,  
And while they mumble thistles you wear bays.

With a chuckle Ramsay retorts:

A' you we ken, but wha the dell  
Bad you up hill Parnassus speel?  
I'll glowm ye dead: in rustic phrase,  
I'll gar my thistle rive your bays.

In his preface to *The Evergreen*, 1724, is a passage which is not only significant as regards Ramsay's natural diction, but also leads easily to our next topic—his enthusiasm over Scotland, her history and literature. "I have observed," he says, "that

Readers of the best and most excellent Discernment frequently complain of our modern Writings as filled with Delicacies and studied Refinements which they would gladly exchange for that natural Strength of Thought and Simplicity of Style our Forefathers practis'd." For these forefathers, it is continually evident, Ramsay has nothing but love and admiration; wherein he resembles most of the later poets of the land which Dr. Johnson despised, and differs vastly from many whiter-livered Scotch historians and *littérateurs*. Howbeit, Allan's blood always boils as he thinks with pride of the independence of his ancestors.

'Twas they could boast their freedom from proud Rome,  
And, arm'd in steel, despise the senate's doom:  
They, only they, unconquered stood their ground,  
And to that mighty empire fixt the bound.

Thus he writes to a "canty callan," and his passionate attachment to the land of his birth probably seemed extravagant to his contemporaries, in whose eyes even the virtues of a barbarous age too often seemed ridiculous or insignificant. That this Scottish independence was ingrained in Ramsay appears from the fact that he was at heart a Jacobite, another frequently Romantic trait. His native canniness, however, never allowed him to go to ruin for a lost cause, although it did not hinder him inserting in *The Tea-Table Miscellany* a poem of veiled Jacobitism, *The Black-Bird*, which was popular until the '45. But whatever his opinions of contemporary politics, there can be no doubt that Ramsay felt an ardent pride in the nation's past, not only in arms, but in literature. Loftily he writes to the Earl of Hartford, in more classical style than usual:

Nor want we Caledonians sage  
Who read the ancient vellum page,  
No stranger to the antique stage  
Of Druid cells  
And sacred ruins of each age  
On plains and fells.

And this, remember, before the great outburst of Romantic antiquarian zeal.

The period which yet more stirs his blood is that of Montgomery, Dunbar, Lindsay, and the other poets represented in the

Bannatyne manuscript. Our poet's growing affection for this collection at last found expression in the two small volumes, "The Evergreen. Being a Collection of Scots Poems wrote by the Ingenious before 1600. Edinburg, 1724." It has been broadly and correctly hinted that a few of the poems, though undoubtedly by the "Ingenious," were produced later even than 1700. Furthermore, Ramsay, as an editor of manuscripts, is hardly up to the modern standard, although no whit behind the redoubtable Percy. The essential point for us is, however, that an able poet took enough interest in the elder "makkaris" to republish and popularize their work among a generation hitherto rather alien to such "barbarous" and "unadorned" productions. "When these good old Bards wrote," he says in his Preface—and note the "Bards," an especially loved word with later Romanticists—"we had not yet made Use of imported Trimmings upon our Cloaths, nor of foreign Embroidery in our Writings. Their poetry is the product of their own Country, not pilfered and spoiled in the Transportation from abroad: their Images are native and their Landskips domestick; copied from those fields and Meadows we every Day behold."

This passage strongly upholds our claim that the sense of nationality and pride of home which are so marked in later Romantic writing already are evident in the work of Ramsay. Much of *The Evergreen's* preface is Wordsworthian in tone and we have already quoted the quasi-Rousseauistic utterance concerning the "affected Delicacies and studied Refinements" of modern literature as compared with "that natural strength of Thought and Simplicity of Stile" of our forefathers. It is thus becoming evident that different shades of the Romantic temperament coexist in Ramsay. Witness the next citation: "In a word, the following Collection will be such another Prospect to the Eye of the Mind as to the outward Eye is the various Meadows where Flowers of different Hue and Smell are mingled together in a beautiful Irregularity." The last two words are especially noteworthy; irregularity is no beauty to the classical mind.

See what a feast of old-time literature he sets before us: *The Wife of Auchtermuchty, The Thistle and the Rose, Robene*

and Makyne, The Lyon and Mouse, The Cherrie and Slae, The Golden Terge, and a couple of good Flytings. These well exemplify the classes of poems now first reintroduced into popular literature, and since become so well known. They indicate an interest in the origins of national literature as genuine as that shown a generation afterward by Percy and his German imitators. "I hope," explains Ramsay, "the Reader when he dips into these Poems will not be displeased with this Reflection, That he is stepping back into the Times that are past and that exist no more." His hope was amply justified, for these poems found ready welcome, and were to have the distinction of largely determining Thomas Percy's bent of mind toward the earlier poets. As late as the publication of the *Reliques* we find the good chaplain following Ramsay's readings, as in the case of Robin and Makyne he acknowledges, even when more correct transcripts from the original were obtainable.

In some measure allied with his admiration of the elder writers is Ramsay's appreciation of Scotland's ballad-literature, the third point of our discussion. In this same year of the publication of *The Evergreen*, 1724, was issued the once-famous *Tea-Table Miscellany*, which, like its predecessor, contained some copies of the Bannatyne manuscript verse. More important, however, and more numerous are the ballads and popular songs which there appear. Ramsay was one of the first ballad-lovers who actually republished the old ballads, and thus in practical wise helped spread the cult of popular poetry. In 1711, it is true, a publisher named Watson had made an obscure, short-lived attempt in this line. Ramsay's crony, the rogue Tom D'Urfey, had issued some corrupt specimens in his *Pills to Purge Melancholy*,<sup>1</sup> 1705-19. But Allan Ramsay was the first to reprint the old songs and ballads with tolerable accuracy and to scatter them broadcast over Britain. In the foreword to his new book he writes about the pieces in his collection: "What further adds to the esteem we have for them is their Antiquity and their being universally known. They

<sup>1</sup> I have found twenty-three pieces by D'Urfey in the four volumes of the *Tea-Table Miscellany*. His influence on Ramsay has, strangely enough, escaped notice, although some contemporary does report finding Tom lolling about one day in Ramsay's *Edinboro'* bookshop when he was supposed to be about his business in London.

are such old verses as have been done time out of mind, and only wanted to be cleared from the Dross of blundering Transcribers and Printers:—such as *The Gaberlunzie Man*, *Muirland Willy*, and the like.”

This, then, is the delightful assemblage of original and traditional poetry so dear to the heart of Burns. Hardly a measure of the Ayrshire poet's Scotch verse fails of some counterpart in Ramsay's original or collected verse. Again, Lockhart shows us a charming glimpse of the young Walter Scott, curled in a window seat, reading the *Tea-Table Miscellany*, which was, Scott tells us, one of his earliest-owned literary treasures; nor can we doubt that it had its own not insignificant effect upon the mental growth of the great Romancer. As already hinted, Percy loved these books, too, and made the most liberal use of them in preparing his *Reliques*, before the appearance of which thirteen regular editions of Ramsay's collection had been printed, and heaven only knows how many piracies. Hence, those three volumes of “*Ancient English Poetry*” dated 1765 were by no means the innovation sometimes supposed. To-day we forget Ramsay's labors in the field of ballad literature chiefly because his books were so popular as to be worn to shreds and lost to us; not because they were unimportant and of small influence. His unclassical compilations were dear to his time, even if it was the time of Pope; but to receive due notice in literary histories this sort of work needed some more dignified and imposing sponsor—say some such clergyman-littérateur as Percy.

Besides *The Gaberlunzie Man* and *Muirland Willy*, we have in the *Miscellany* for the first time printed the quaint songs, full of the spirit of the old Scottish peasantry, *Maggie's Tocher*, and *The Wooing of Jok and Jynny*, vivid, humorous, and realistic. John Ochiltree appears, and a partially purified Auld Rab Morris, the song which Burns later washed yet again and definitely introduced into polite society. Little more than a catalogue of musical Scots town-names, yet having a particular fascination, is minstrel Burne's *Leader Haughs and Yarrow*. This song, by the way, is another curious mixture of Romantic with classical. In the first two stanzas Phœbus, Aries, Saturn, and Flora figure

in very approved fashion. Nicol Burne is a good imitator. Presently, however, his own heart wins, and he sings of the hunted hare speeding

O'er dub and dyke, o'er seugh and syke:  
 She'll rin the fields a'thorow,  
 Till failld she's fa'n in Leader Haughs  
 And bids farewell to Yarrow.

Of still another class Ramsay gives us the two incomparable songs, *Waly, Waly up the Bank* (here first printed) and *Balow my Roy; Lady Bothwell's Lament*. *Tak your Auld Cloak About You*, the popular song quoted partially in *Othello*, also appears here for the first time. Some of these pieces are the A-texts in Child's collection, whence it is evident that in estimating the ballad-side of Romanticism it is unsafe to leave Allan Ramsay out of consideration. This sort of poetry is also represented in *The Evergreen*, though to a less extent, notably in the case of Johnnie Armstrang, "the true old Ballad, never printed before. This I copied from a Gentleman's mouth," he adds in a note. I venture to say that he was among the first to go to this pains, a course which later became so common.

With these relics of popular poetry inserted in his collections Ramsay intermingles other ballads of a type not so old. That much-discussed ballad-imitation, *Hardyknute*, probably by Mrs. Wardlaw, was in both the *Miscellany* and *The Evergreen*. Scott found it in the former, and wrote in after days, "*Hardyknute* was the first poem I ever learnt—the last I shall forget"; another reason for ranking Ramsay among the initiators of this phase of Romanticism. Here, too, appeared David Malloch's alteration of William and Margaret, that "auld ballad," the exact status of which is still, perhaps, a moot point. The poems of this class have the simple ballad measure, but superadd a subtlety of thought and turn of phrase which are so alien to the form as to verge on the ridiculous, despite the effectiveness of certain passages. Later Romantic ballad imitations, notably those of Coleridge, display the same dangerous tendency. Of the remaining songs in the *Tea-Table Miscellany*, only three volumes of which are compiled by Ramsay himself, a goodly proportion are new combinations of old



song and ballad fragments, connected, occasionally slightly purified, and generally fitted for what was then refined society. The work is thus a veritable mine of early poetry, the ore containing varying degrees of dross. When all criticisms have been made, the fact remains that Ramsay's volumes are immeasurably superior to any predecessors in their field, and that they compare favorably with any later compilations of the eighteenth century. If, then, we accept the verdict of literary historians, that popular ballad poetry and song are important in connection with the beginnings of the Romantic movement, we may feel safe in claiming for Allan Ramsay in this respect also an honorable place among the pioneers of Romanticism.

It remains, finally, to consider "canty Allan's" attitude toward nature, always a significant element in writings tinged with Romanticism. Here we are on certain ground, for he views the outer world with his own clear eyes and records his impressions with hilarious disregard of the hackneyed descriptions of conventional Classicism. We stated in beginning this paper that the four Romantic tendencies to be considered in Ramsay's works come into prominence in proper chronological sequence as they are taken up in this essay, and it is most notably in his last important publication, *The Gentle Shepherd*, that this last point, Ramsay's attitude toward nature, becomes noteworthy. Into this pastoral he pours the treasures of his personal observation, telling us with hearty delight how he visits "ilk cleugh, ilk craig, and hollow den." Read his song describing the lass of Peaty's mill,

When tedding of the hay  
Bareheaded on the green,

and his jovial declaration that

Our blackbirds, mavises, and linnets,  
Excel your fiddles, flutes, and spinnets,

and be convinced that literature is emerging from the bondage of laws which permit mention of reapers and of feathered songsters, but scarcely of hay-tedding and of mavises. To forestall objection, we may repeat that Ramsay is at times sufficiently conventional and dull, as in allusions to *Lais*, *Cupid*, *Varo*, *Daphne*, and *Phyl-*

lis. In fact he is a queer compound. In one song, nay, in two consecutive lines we find,

Say, lovely Adonis, say,  
Has Mary deceived thee?

—a mixture highly characteristic. Nevertheless, Bonnie Christy, Bessie Bell, Maggie, Katy, Peggy, and Mary Gray more than atone for the occasional intrusion of a goddess.

To return from this brief digression: it was Ramsay who first gave the world that "thoroughly Romantic" song by William Hamilton Bangour, "The Braes of Yarrow." In this song occur those touches of specific nature which fascinated Wordsworth and are referred to in his Yarrow poems:

Flows Yarrow sweet as sweet flows Tweed,  
As green its grass, its gowan as yellow,  
As sweet smell on its braes the birk,  
The apples from its rocks as mellow,

etc., etc. This is the sort of nature-description which Ramsay loves to publish and imitate, and precisely such definite, fresh pictures abound in *The Gentle Shepherd*, the unique pastoral drama to which Courthope refers as "Classical in form, Romantic in feeling." Further examination, by the way, might have convinced this critic that even the Classicism of form suffers serious lapses. The poem opens with the shepherds Roger and Patie (not Strephon and Damon) discussing "beneath the south side of a shady bield" as to the sorrows of love. Their site would seem propitious for romantic events. Presently Patie sings that unclassical and unusually delicate charming lyric:

My Peggy is a young thing  
Just entered in her teens,  
Fair as the day and sweet as May,  
Fair as the day and always gay,  
My Peggy is a young thing  
And I'm not verra auld,  
And dear I loe to meet wi' her  
At wawking o' the fauld.

Few things in Burns excel this song. There follows a parley on love's uncertainty, blate Roger finding new heart in blythe Patie's

lively first-hand report of the ways of nature, inanimate or animate. Witness in Act I, 1, lines beginning,

I saw my Meg come linkin' ower the lea,  
I saw my Meg, but Meggy saw na me.  
Her coats were kiltit and did sweetly shaw  
Her straight bare legs sae whiter than the snaw.  
Her cheeks were ruddy and her e'en sae clear,  
And O! her mou's like ony hinny-pear.

The next scene begins with a characteristic glimpse of Scots country:

A flowrie howm between twa verdant braes,  
Whaur lassies use to wash and spread their claes;  
A trotting burnle whimplin' through the ground,  
Its channel pebbles shinin' smooth and round.

And so the poem runs on, fresh, distinct, and detailed nature everywhere. Just one more specimen of its kind, where the enraptured Patie lilts to Peggy:

When corn grew yellow and the heather bells  
Bloomed bonny on the moor and rising fells,  
Nae birns, or briars, or whins e'er troubled me  
Gif I could find blaeberries ripe for thee.

Another trait which the true Romanticist almost invariably possesses is the love of the mountains and other spots rude and inaccessible. With this sentiment Allan entirely sympathizes. Already we have cited a part of the splendid ode:

Look up to Pentland's towering tap,  
Buried beneath great wreaths of snaw.

Again he writes of standing on a rising ground, gazing at the

Domes which hide their turrets in the clouds  
In majesty sublime,

and refers now and again to his beloved

Northern mountains clad wi' snaw  
Whaur whistlin' winds incessant blaw.

Highland and lowland, summer and winter, each and every aspect of nature can yield joy to Ramsay.

I own 'tis sma' encouragement to sing  
When round one's lugs the blatran hailstones ring.  
But feckfu' folk can front the baldest wind,  
An' shrink thro' muirs an' never fash their mind.

And to the end of his life he sings of the

— gowans, broom, and trees;  
The wimplin' burn, the westlin' breeze;  
The bleetin' ewes, and blisy bees.

Our point regarding Ramsay's sympathetic attitude toward nature, his direct, personal, and unclassical appreciation thereof, can be absolutely maintained. Despite the many quotations, here is one more, written in 1729 to William Somerville. The lines sound like those of an unmatured Rousseau:

With more of nature than of art,  
From stated rules I often start.  
I love at large to frisk and bound  
Unmankl'd o'er poetic ground.  
I love the garden wild and wide,  
Where oaks have plum trees by their side.  
Where mixt jonckeels and gowans grow,  
And roses 'mid rank clover blow  
Upon a bank of some clear strand,  
Its wimplin's led by nature's hand.

This to me's a paradise,  
Compar'd with prim-cut plots and nice,  
Where nature has to art resign'd  
Till all looks mean, stiff, and confin'd.

May still my notes of rustic turn  
Gain more of your respect than scorn:  
The native bards first plunge the deep  
Before the artful dare to leap.

The reader who has trained himself to catch the signs of Romantic mood will find here plain indications of more than one variety of the temperament.

Thus, then, Allan Ramsay's claim to a place among the fore-runners of Romanticism is vindicated. Obviously, certain elements of the Romantic temper are lacking in him—the sense of wonder and mystery, for example, although there is a hint of this in *The Vision* and in the witch episodes of *The Gentle Shepherd*. Furthermore, we may say in general that he is too well balanced to be hurried away by any melancholy wild-eyed search after the remote or fantastic. Howbeit, within certain well-defined limits, his importance in the early history of the movement is

undeniable. He consciously adopts a popular, humorous, specific, frequently colloquial diction, and he seeks local color. Fired with patriotism, he familiarizes himself with Scotland's history and her older literature and brings this back into popularity with his contemporaries. In like manner he is influential in starting the enthusiasm for ballad-literature a whole generation before Percy and his ilk commenced their work. Finally, he gives us in his original verse the fresh, spontaneous results of a personal observation of the world of nature. In his love for the primitive Scotland and in his exaltation of the forefathers Ramsay suggests Rousseau, in his feeling for nature he exhibits the simpler side of what later was the cult of Wordsworth, and in his ballad enthusiasm he anticipates Percy. The Bishop of Dromore, Robert Burns, and Walter Scott all testify to his influence upon themselves, and we may surmise his popularity with the general public from the fact that before 1800 twenty regular editions and numerous pirated issues of *The Tea-Table Miscellany* had appeared and had been so generally worn that to-day the appearance of a copy in the auction room is something of an event. For his original poems the demand was hardly less constant, while in almost every one of the great host of eighteenth-century song-books—"Garlands," "Larks," "Goldfinches," "Nightingales," etc., etc.—anywhere from one sixth to one third of the songs are usually Ramsay's, although generally uncredited to him.

In view of all these facts it seems just to assert that Allan Ramsay deserves more general recognition than he has to-day, and a more eminent seat among the pioneers of Romanticism.

Cynd Allen Hirsch

**ART X.—METHODISM'S PRIDE AND PERIL**

THE name of Methodist came to us by way of reproach and derision. Yet, though this was its origin, it is clearly characterized by that insight—often amounting to positive genius—which nicknames have so often displayed. One proof of this lies in the fact that we have been content to acquiesce in this judgment of our enemies and now wear honorably the term thus flung at us in scorn. Another is found in the truth that it accurately denotes, even while it derided, that fervor wedded to form which is at once our dignity and our danger, our pride and our peril—our pride, because it is part of John Wesley's distinction that he was able to so wisely use and conserve the fire which his ministry so marvelously kindled. For history reveals how similar conflagrations had blazed before, but only to consume the frail bushes which had served to manifest them. In such methods as the society class and the love feast, however, Wesley found for us a furnace in which the fire could not only be maintained, but also vastly developed. So much so that at the present day Methodism practically belts the globe. We are a denomination upon which the sun never sets.

Yet while such methods are peculiarly our own, and of their record we are justly proud, we must not forget that it is in their spirituality, and not in their singularity, that their attraction and influence has truly lain. The mere uniqueness of the furnace has never been enough for the genuine Methodist—there must be a fire in it, too; and if for any reason that fire should burn low, or die down, he is of all men the most miserable. And in this he is a true disciple of the Wesleys, for they, too, made much of this fire. Thus Fisher, the church historian, says of John: "Wesley was an Arminian in theology. The emphasis which he laid on the need of the Holy Spirit, and the fervent zeal which pervaded the entire Wesleyan movement, created the widest disparity between Methodist Arminianism as a practical system and the old Arminianism of Holland and England. The Wesleyan faith was



Arminianism on fire" (Italics mine). (History of the Church, page 519.) As for Charles, let one stanza of a hymn suffice:

See how great a flame aspires,  
Kindled by a spark of grace!  
Jesus' love the nations fires,  
Sets the kingdoms on a blaze.  
To bring fire on earth he came;  
Kindled in some hearts it is:  
O that all might catch the flame,  
All partake the glorious bliss!

Terms such as these, and others kindred to them—like burn and melt—stud the lines of his hymns throughout. And herein lies the true secret of all our success. It began that memorable evening, at about quarter to nine, when John's heart was "strangely warmed" by contact with the Spirit through the Word. And, thus equipped, he was able to meet that need of his age of which Fisher earlier speaks, when he says: "The Puritan spirit had not died out. In many a parish church, and in many a dissenting congregation, the gospel was faithfully preached and practically accepted. Yet what was needed was a more *kindling proclamation of the old truth*" (Italics mine). (Ibid., p. 513.) And ever since in our history "hearts strangely warmed" and "kindling presentations of the truth" have borne a direct and intimate relation to each other and contained the essence of our success. Long, then, may the Methodist retain his genius for form and his devotion to fervor, for in keeping these he guards the issues of his denominational life. And if, in the providence of God, a more organic unity of the various churches should take place, they will be valuable assets for him to carry over and exercise under whatever conditions may then prevail.

There is, however, another side to all this; for, while form and fervor have thus constituted our strength, they have also been a grave source of weakness and still lay us open to serious peril. To the former we can trace a fruitful cause of all our unhappy divisions; for we have quarreled more over methods than anything else. In proof of this we need only to glance down the list of names borne by the seventeen different Methodist Churches in the United States. Here we find almost all forms of church govern-

ment—from Apostolic and Episcopal to Congregational and Free. We have color lines and clerical lines, but no trace of one drawn by creed. And if we turn to the home of Methodism in England, it is the same story still, except that there we have the Calvinistic Methodists separated from the rest of their brethren by a difference in doctrine. But the other branches of the household stand apart purely and solely on the question of method, for the Wesleyans refused to have dealings with the Primitives on account of their adoption of a modified form of our American camp meetings, while the new United Church, formed by the union of Bible Christian, Free Church, and New Connexion Methodists, differs from each of the beforenamed on the matter of lay representation in Conference. Nor must we forget that we have General Booth and the Salvation Army largely because what was then the New Connexion could not tolerate the novel methods of its most distinguished son. Surely these people are rightly called *Methodists!* Now we could, perhaps, afford to smile at all this but for the fact that we are not yet out of the wood. For, though denominational division in this fashion is hardly probable again, yet in another form the problem is with us still. Thus we have those in our midst who think that the panacea for all our present woes will be found in a revival of the class meeting and love feast, while many others disparage these as out of date and call urgently for more modern methods. Now between these it is not our business here to adjudicate, but it is worth while to point out that there is danger lest the advocacy of either old or new forms should at bottom be but a vain desire to put up a furnace in the hope thereby of getting a fire. If so, it is a reversal of the true order which our founders followed, for they built their furnace at the call of the fire and never dreamed of a fire at the call of a furnace. Yet this is what the present-day craze for organization often amounts to. And it is by no means confined to the Methodist Church, for there be many nowadays who, to quote Dr. Charles Jefferson, think "that another wheel on the Lord's chariot will mean greater progress." But we, alas, have our full share of this and need to beware lest *our* furnace loom so large as to stifle what fire we have.

Well, then, some may say, let us concentrate on the fire. Very good; but even in this we must proceed with great care, for a mistake in this matter is more serious than error in methods. And it is easy to make such mistake unless we have learned well the lesson taught to the prophet Elijah—that there is a fire from the Lord and a fire in which the Lord is *not*. (Cf. 1 Kings 18. 38, and 19. 12.) Modern psychology has revealed how it lies in our power to work up the latter; but its effects are those of fever rather than fervor, and healthy-minded persons instinctively avoid it. The former is constituted by the “Holy Ghost sent down from heaven” (1 Peter 1. 12); and though man is active as well as passive in its reception, this activity is primarily moral, for God giveth the Holy Spirit to them that *obey* him. (Acts 5. 32.) An enlightened conscience must, therefore, be our compass in this quest, else, like some aforetime, we shall make shipwreck of our faith (1 Tim. 1. 19); and for this our conscience compass must point steadily to the pole star of our life, even Jesus the Christ. For there is much truth in that agraphon of Jesus preserved by Origen, whether it be genuine or not: “He who is near Me is near the fire.”

C. Stunges Ball

## EDITORIAL DEPARTMENTS

---

### NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

---

#### THE THINGS WHICH REMAIN

BISHOP GOODSSELL, of blessed memory, published under the above title a few years ago an address which he had been giving to the young ministers at the Conferences. In it he sought to reassure their minds concerning the attack made upon the Bible by the critics. He urged that there should be a slow and guarded acceptance of such critical opinions as were widely divergent from "the faith once delivered to the saints." He showed how very much there was that must perforce remain after the removal of such things as could be shaken; showed that the great truths of Christianity will survive the most radical investigation of the Scriptures, nay, that every one of these truths has increasing confirmation as we accumulate the teachings of science, history, and religious experience. The little book, as well as the episcopal charge on which it was based, must have confirmed the faith of many and done much good.

And now it is possible that a similar service may be rendered in a somewhat different field. We have reached the quadrennially recurring period when there is the most vigorous shaking of very many things pertaining to our Methodism, and it would not be surprising if many were led to tremble lest the very pillars of our ecclesiastical temple should come down. They see pretty much everything put to the proof and challenged to show cause why it should any longer survive. Some very sacred matters are not exempt from attack. There are those bold enough to inaugurate schemes which, if adopted, would change our beloved Zion almost beyond recognition. Changes of the most thoroughgoing sort do not lack advocates. There would seem to be nothing so foolish but some sponsor is found for it, nothing so destructive but that there are those who think it might be well enough to experiment with it. And in the midst of this general house-cleaning, when every nook and corner of the ancient edifice is being minutely scrutinized for traces of decay or pollution, when things are being stirred up on every hand and confusion seems to be the order of the day, it would

appear to be an exceptionally good time to look calmly over the field and count up the things which, after all, are very certain to abide, which no storm can jeopardize or oscillate, which will be found, when the temporary tumult has subsided, only the more firmly fixed in their places. When the apostle speaks of the "removing of those things that are shaken," he says it is "that those things which are not shaken may remain. Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace whereby we may offer service well pleasing to God with reverence and awe."

And this it is, this "kingdom that cannot be shaken," which, by God's grace, is assured to us as our permanent Methodist heritage, while General Conferences come and General Conferences go, that we propose here to consider. It is scarcely necessary that we take up the doctrinal side of it, for that has been well done by Bishop Goodsell, and, moreover, is not in any danger of disturbance at the hands of the Minneapolis legislators. The changing of the Articles of Religion and the establishment of "new standards or rules of doctrine" is the one thing which they are peremptorily and forever forbidden to do, a remarkable constitutional provision, well calculated to produce theological peace and testifying strongly to the subordinate place given theology by the whole genius and spirit of Methodism. It was an important part of her mission from the first to mitigate the ferocity of the old creeds and creed makers and to promise a charitable liberality of opinion on all those topics about which so little is absolutely known. Methodism has never laid its main stress on orthodoxy, nor has it shown any tendency to bigotry. It started out as a revival of pure and undefiled religion, and, when at its best, has devoted its energies chiefly to the spiritual life, feeling that speculations and dogmas not closely connected with this were of small import. We are fully persuaded that in this path of wisdom it will continue to walk. It certainly will so far as it holds true to the influences that gave it birth and to the channels of its main service to the world.

The amazing prosperity which, by God's blessing, has come to us as a church—our growth since 1812 is from 688 traveling preachers to 20,569, and from 184,567 members to 3,543,589—can fairly be ascribed to three sources, namely, our reasonable doctrines, our earnest piety, and our wonderfully articulated, splendidly efficient form of government. Opinions may differ as to which of these three has had the most to do with our advance. It is certain that all

are important, that neither could be spared. Doctrines which could not be preached, which would alienate thinking people and outrage common sense, which would cut the nerve of effort by laying inordinate stress on divine sovereignty and minimizing good works, would have been a most serious hindrance to our progress. We could hardly have got any start at all had we been thus heavily handicapped. Still more fatal would have been spiritual apathy and religious coldness, for no church can conquer the world if it be permeated by the worldly spirit, nor can it receive the blessing of its Head if it be not filled with burning love for him and a determined purpose to carry out his commands. But zeal, no matter how fervent, and enthusiasm, howsoever intense, if not rightly directed and skillfully correlated, must be largely wasted. The bravery of the individual soldiers in an army accomplishes little except that army be completely organized and competently commanded. Able leadership, clever strategy, close coördination count overwhelmingly in a campaign; so much so that it has been said, "Better an army of lambs led by a lion than an army of lions led by a lamb."

In view of all this we are disposed to put the methods of the Methodists as, at least, not inferior to anything in explaining their success. An important confirmation of this is the example of those denominations which have had doctrines but little differing from ours, together with a very good degree of religious zeal, but with a very different form of organization. May not their comparative failure be reasonably ascribed to this latter defect? Especially must this be the case where they have gone out from us solely because of objections to our polity, retaining precisely the same doctrines and presumably the same degree of piety, but have immediately fallen back in the race.

We are driven, then, irresistibly to the conclusion that a very large, possibly the major, portion of our thriving is due to our admirable organization. Yet, of course, organization alone is not sufficient; there must be power as well as machinery, and only when these two things are duly safeguarded and vigorously promoted may the largest results be looked for. If our polity should be seriously mangled at Minneapolis, or any steps taken that would decrease our grip on God, then, indeed, calamity will have befallen us and the road to ruin have been entered upon. And since these two things are quite possible, although, we trust, by no means probable, the eyes of the church will be bent on that city with much intentness



during the month before us, and the prayers of the faithful will ascend night and day that our Zion may get no harm, but rather be so strengthened at every point as to become still more than in the past a mighty agency for the blessing of mankind and the glory of God.

We cannot persuade ourselves that there is much danger. It may be granted that not all who have been selected as lawmakers are men of wisdom and experience, and that some questionable things have in the past found favor with a temporary majority of well-meaning but wearied and worried men, moved upon, perhaps, in the hurried closing days, by some gust of sentiment or wind of eloquence. But, after all, large bodies are conservative; weighted with responsibility, they are apt to be overtimid rather than rash. They deeply feel, as they should, the very serious consequences that would come to the Kingdom of God if they were to make a mistake on any vital matter. It seems to them safer to let well enough alone than to run the risk of disaster by hasty alteration. Where it is so difficult to foresee what may eventually result from a proposal that has, indeed, much to recommend it, but is fairly certain to develop evils of its own when put in practical operation, the greater number are generally disposed to draw back and be content with as slight a modification as it is possible to get on with. Very young men are not often sent to General Conference. The delegations are apt to be made up in the main of those whose blood has been cooled by many winters and who have learned in the school of hard experience to discount the claims and promises of measures which profess to open the gates of Eutopia.

We are, then, measurably safe. It is quite probable things will remain very much as at present, the same in all essential particulars after the first of June as on the first of May. Our general and district superintendency will not undergo any radical revision. How can they, with profit to the church? From the days of John Wesley the man on horseback has been the most conspicuous figure in our onward march. With headquarters in the saddle, he has paid little heed to entrenchments, he has not arranged for restful encampment, he has regarded obstacles as merely points for victorious attack. Aggression has been the policy. We were constituted for practical achievement. Diocesan episcopacy would not have done the work in days past; it will not do it now. We want none of it. Nor do we think that the slight modification of it which goes under the name

of a districted episcopacy will commend itself to the best judgment of our great deliberative assembly. The kind of leadership which our bishops give in a large free way, overseeing the whole field, binding the entire denomination together, imparting unity and coherency, should not be sacrificed or jeopardized, and cannot be combined with that local leadership for which other instrumentalities are sufficiently provided and better adapted. There is still imperative need for the "itinerant general superintendency." Its plan will neither be destroyed nor essentially infringed upon. Of this we may be confident.

The superintendency of the districts it is quite possible, as we look at it, to strengthen in various ways, by bringing these officers into closer relations with those over whom they are immediately placed, relieving them of certain outworn functions not everywhere called for now as in earlier times, and adapting them skillfully to the changed conditions. Here, if anywhere, the wisdom of the General Conference will be tested, as it shows us how to retain all that is really important in the old-style presiding eldership, while introducing such minor modifications as will give the office a fresh lease of life and commend it anew to the judgment and affection of the generation before us.

That other vital nerve center of our polity, the most distinctive characteristic probably of our whole economy, the itinerancy of the ministry, will not, we judge, be particularly affected, or perhaps touched at all. That there is dissatisfaction with the present arrangement and slight friction in its working, counts for little. When has there not been such friction? How is it possible that there should not be friction in a system that demands oftentimes no little sacrifice on the part of both pastor and people, and occasionally requires marked heroism, particularly from the preacher. Until human nature is different, there cannot be perfect smoothness in such things. Yet God has wonderfully blessed our polity at this point, and it is certain that without it Methodism never could have won its historic triumphs, never have put its forces to such magnificent and economical use. The best way to minimize the friction is to magnify the consecration. Without a great deal of religion our machinery will not work evenly and efficiently. It was built on that basis. Love is the essential lubricator. It is necessary in our polity that the holy anointing oil be abundantly poured forth, the unction divine supplied copiously, or things will grate harshly and grind oppres-

sively. If self, not the cause of Christ, be put uppermost, if there be pushing for place, rather than pressing the battle against sin, if personal interests, instead of the interests of the Kingdom, are at the front, if the main thought is how to secure prestige and promotion, how to avoid discomfort and depreciation, then, indeed, perhaps some scheme may be contrived that will better serve these purposes than does the present arrangement. But is it well to cater to the weaknesses of humanity? Is it not preferable to hold firmly by the ideal plan and summon all concerned to prove themselves worthy of it? That pastor and people should not be severed arbitrarily, so long as there is mutual profit and prosperity, is surely well. That our system of appointments should be kept on this broad, high, free basis, whereby we attain all the benefits that come from a settled ministry without losing those which pertain to the itinerancy, as the experience of the past twelve years has proved, seems altogether best, productive of as little trouble as is compatible with ordinary human nature and helpful to the cultivation of the noblest qualities. We can but think it will be one of the things which remain.

What the church needs most of all, we cannot but feel and see and say, is a larger infusion of spiritual passion and a larger impartation of spiritual power. Let the General Conference do its utmost to increase this, and it will have deserved grandly of the church. It is on this that everything else hinges. How can the missionary and other benevolent treasuries be filled except the church learn to hold all its possessions sacredly in trust for the work of the Lord? How can there be constant additions of such as are being saved unless the church exhibits a type of piety that attracts and has a burning love for souls? A thoroughgoing surrender of self is involved here, a vital union with Christ by faith, and an uncommon spirit of devotion. Without this deep work what avail the various "movements" of the day, with their dinners and their demonstrations? They do but scratch the surface, and after the temporary ebullition has passed they inevitably die down. Aggressive evangelism is good, but behind that, if it is to have permanence, there must be dynamic Christianity, the Pentecostal endowment, a religion that has rapture. Just here is Methodism's chief need, as it was once its chief asset. Not numbers; they will take care of themselves. Not wealth; money will come in sufficient quantities when the heart is wholly surrendered. A fuller, larger, keener, stronger spiritual

life will set everything right. This is our excuse for being; this is that for which, if true to our history, we are bound to stand in the face of the sun. This is the old-time spirit. Can it be brought back and reproduced in the midst of modern conditions? On this depends our future. The spirit of which we speak was one of deep and permanent religious exhilaration, a spirit stopped by no difficulties or discouragements, a spirit that found vent in jubilant song, ringing testimony, fervent exhortation. The fathers had a matchless love for the Saviour and an absorbing passion for souls. They were filled with undying devotion and tireless energy. They were irrepressibly eager to fulfill their calling. They proclaimed with marvelous effectiveness free grace and dying love, the cross of Jesus and the power of the Holy Ghost, deliverance from all sin and the full reign of perfect peace. We need precisely this at present. We need nothing else half so much. This, and this alone, will put us where we ought to be—at the head of the advancing hosts of Prince Immanuel, leading on the armies of the King, fulfilling our destiny, and setting an example to other communions, doing our full share, and more, in bringing all nations to the feet of their Redeemer. It may be that the General Conference cannot or will not help us much at this point, but we are hoping that in some way it may plant the standard higher and call around it, by some thrilling battle cry, those who shall win marvelous victories for the King in the days immediately before us.

What we certainly have a right to expect of it, wherever else it may fail, is to give the church, in the additions made to the episcopacy, a set of leaders spiritually and intellectually equipped to do the very grandest kind of service. There must be such men somewhere available. Can they be discovered and brought to the front? It would mean everything to us if there could be put into the place of power some more than royal personality, let us say, like Hugh Price Hughes, who would do for us what he did for English Methodism. He has been well described as "a perfect embodiment of the central, imperishable characteristics of Methodism." His life and work marked an epoch in the progress of his denomination. He had the veritable spirit of the founder adapted to the needs of the present day—the same high quality of religious devotion; the same single-eyed consecration to the welfare of men; the same passionate love for souls; the same sympathy with the toiling, suffering millions; the same readiness to sacrifice in their behalf scholarly aptitudes

and literary tastes; the same courage to break with the past; the same statesmanlike grasp of the future by which right positions were almost instantly taken and held with increasing tenacity in spite of all obstacles; the same cheerful audacity, the same freedom from bigotry, from narrowness of spirit and smallness of mind; the same far-reaching plans, love for the church, for missions, for freedom, for men; the same punctuality, industry, enthusiasm, power to draw after him a great following; the same deadness to the love of money. The words on his tombstone are those which were most frequently on his lips, and which reveal more than any other the secret of his life: "Thou, O Christ, art all I want." He said, "Since I have thee, what is there to lose—what can any man do unto me since thou art here? What wouldst thou, Lord? What shall I say, whither go, what do? If I die, 'tis gain, for I see thee. If I live, 'tis but to serve thee." He had that personal intimate love for Jesus Christ which we find in some of the old saints of the Middle Ages; and yet how full he was of the throbbings of the most vivid modern life. Such men, of course, are rare. But such men are preëminently the hope and life of any church. May not one, at least, of this high stamp be found and designated when the ballots are counted at Minneapolis? It would fully justify the cost of the assembly.

A great Conference shall it be? A model Conference, one wherein none of the precious, costly time is wasted by needless points of order or speeches merely for display, where business has strict attention and the highest good of the Kingdom is kept ever uppermost, where all matters are carefully sifted in committee and all committee reports are duly acted on before adjournment, where the rightful expectations of the church are fully met, and after the shaking, nothing which ought to remain will have been dropped out and nothing retained which should have been cast aside? This may be too much to look for. Human nature will be very much in evidence. Mistakes, no doubt, will be made both of omission and commission. Just one hundred years ago, when ninety men assembled in New York city on the first of May, for the first delegated General Conference, it would seem, from our standpoint, that a pretty serious mistake was made in voting down propositions to forbid preachers retailing spirituous or malt liquors and buying lottery tickets. The proposal to authorize the election of presiding elders by the Annual Conferences came within three votes of passing.

But the appointive eldership has weathered many fierce storms and will be, in all probability, one of the things which remain.

After Conference, what? We shall soon be facing a new quadrennium, with some new leaders and some new measures. All the machinery will have been searchingly examined, a few flaws detected, a few improvements accomplished, and everything put in shape, it may be hoped, for the very largest achievements. But there is much which legislation cannot do. There are "restrictive rules" of another kind than those mentioned in the Discipline. In the nature of things the power of law is very limited. The power of the Holy Ghost, that, and that alone, will sufficiently avail. The fire of God must be brought anew upon the waiting hearts of the people, a passion for his will must take full possession of their souls, an ever deepening dedication of their all must become the standing order of every day—then everything else, of temporal good and ecclesiastical prosperity, will, without doubt, be added. If the General Conference helps on this to the utmost of its ability, it will have deserved conspicuously well of its constituency.



## THE ARENA

---

### IS THE CHURCH BEHIND THE TIMES ?

THE charge is often heard in these days, from friend and foe, that the church is behind the times. What is meant by this saying? Does it mean that outside of and apart from the church institutions and activities are springing up and flourishing which ought to have been organized within it and remained a part of the church? The answer depends upon our viewpoint. It cannot be denied that there are several significant movements definitely and avowedly seeking the social and moral betterment of mankind, owing their inception to the church, and drawing their inspiration from the gospel of Jesus, whose activities are carried on, to say the least, outside the recognized sphere of the church.

1. National and international peace movements. To be sure, commerce and diplomacy are at present working this way; but underneath there is a growing sense of humanitarianism, a sense of social solidarity, of human brotherhood, a regard for human rights, a consciousness that the stronger ought to help the weaker, rather than exploit and crush him—feelings and ideals which are the product of the gospel. The Prince of Peace is slowly, but surely, we believe, coming to his own. Many devout Christian men are champions of this movement, but it is apart from the church.

2. The struggle for greater civil and religious liberty is on in almost every civilized nation. Fanaticism is not wanting. Hate sometimes bursts forth in violence. Great wrongs are committed in this name. Sometimes the good suffers with the evil. Virtuous men and vicious men are on the same side of the struggle. But demand for largest liberties, born of a sense of inherent divine rights, always attends the gospel. Christian peoples must be free; and the more Christian, the larger their individual liberties. Multitudes of loyal Christians are personally involved in these struggles, but the church has no part therein.

3. In our nation-wide campaign for civic reforms, civic house-cleaning, our manifestations of civic conscience, and our demand for civic righteousness, perhaps a million or more Christian men and women are taking a more or less active part, and the leaders are, in most cases, Christian men working under New Testament inspiration. After a splendid victory recently in a great city, in the midst of his felicitations, a zealous and efficient brother minister said: "Yes, it is magnificent; but where are the churches?" The church in that city is strong, and the movement was headed by strong laymen, with a great many of the ministers coöperating; yet the church seemed to be no part of it.

4. In the "irrepressible conflict" between capital and labor, perhaps most intense in America, where is the church? The church should have been always the place where "the rich and the poor meet together." Just

now the church is busy trying to explain the alienation of the wageworker; and several of the great denominations have official commissions to study the situation and discover remedies. It must be admitted that the attitude of organized labor, in its struggle "not for charity, but for justice," is one of pronounced hostility to the church, which, say they, has betrayed and abandoned its original trust. Yet there are in the ranks of organized labor multitudes of devout, intelligent, loyal Christians. Many ministers and other religious leaders, too, are sturdy advocates of the rights of the laboring man in his conflict with conscienceless capital. But this movement—one of the most profound, serious, and dangerous—proceeds apart from the church.

5. Does the church understand the almost chaotic conditions in the educational realm? Since the exclusion of the Bible from our public schools the separation of church and school seems complete. But our youth are affected more by our schools than by any other institution. The Sabbath has become a holiday. The Sunday evening service has to compete with the theater and meet the moving-picture show on its own ground. With every year the moral burden thrown upon the school increases. Meanwhile the school has troubles of its own. Multiplied subjects, some still unorganized, have been added to the curricula. Wide privilege of election has been carried down into the high school. New methods of teaching are being tried out. Student self-government and school-city experiments abound. Secret societies in secondary schools are troublesome. Home discipline has practically collapsed. The teacher is more and more *in loco parentis*, and the school *in loco ecclesiae*. The ethics and morals of the rising generation will be colored more by the school than by the church. Tens of thousands of teachers are members of our churches, and heroically trying to stem the tide. Christian parents are agonized at the prevalence of worldliness and the tide away from the church, but the church seems to be not in the struggle.

Other items may be briefly mentioned. Paradoxical as it may seem, the growing demand for comity among the Protestant churches, that every considerable community shall have a church and none shall be overchurched, is heard as much without the church as within. Even the organized Bible-class movement seems to be separate from the church quite as much as within the church. There are those who say that these great movements, and all such, born of the spirit of the gospel, and working for the extension of the kingdom of "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," these movements, arising from the teachings of Christ and fundamentally in harmony with his spirit and purpose, ought to be part and parcel of the church; and that the church, as such, ought to take her rightful place of leadership in all movements for the abolition of every form of unrighteousness. On the other hand, there are those who say these are legitimate offshoots from the church. They could not be born, nor could they continue, without the church. The church furnishes the inspiration for these all, as for the Y. M. C. A., the W. C. T. U., etc. It evidences great vitality and tremendous resources to be able to send out army after army to meet the enemy from all quarters. So all these

agencies, "making for righteousness," rooted in and nourished by the church, are bearing abundant fruit fit for the Kingdom. Let the church continue to be the prolific mother of movements and methods, fertile in expedient; abundant in strategy. Let the church be like the sun, throwing off smaller bodies to go their rounds of service, and when they have ceased to serve to receive and absorb them again.

And the minister? Why should he, one man, assume to captain every separate company? Let him rather be the general. Let him, if he be able, give organization and inspiration to the whole army, and so fill every soldier with zeal that is according to knowledge that everyone will find place for his best service. In this way the church will not be behind the times, but will be the energizing power in the midst.

Chinese Mission, San Francisco, Cal.

EDWARD JAMES.

---

#### TACT AS AN ASSET

THE Hon. James Bryce, the British Ambassador at Washington, is said to be a most tactful man. His long, successful, and eminently popular career would seem to confirm this view. No man could have gone through such a long public life with such credit to himself and with such general admiration had he not large resources and a vast amount of tact. At a luncheon Mr. Bryce is said to have defined tact in these words: "Tact is the ability to remove the sting from a dangerous stinger without getting stung." That is as good as the definition given in the dictionary: "Tact is the ready power of appreciating and doing what is required by circumstances."

The tactful man was in the mind of G. K. Chesterton, when he said: "There is a great man who makes every man feel small. But the real great man is the man who makes every man feel great." The following is most comprehensive: "Tact means thinking about others. It means considering what others will think, instead of considering only what we think about ourselves. It means acting in concert with others, instead of acting only for ourselves; imitation tact may be insincere and selfish in its purposes; but real tact is unselfish in action, and that is why it gains so much and wins so many hearts."

Children can easily be influenced by a discerning use of right methods. A mother who had been away from home for several weeks returned to find that her children, a boy and a girl, were freely using in the home a large variety of slang which they had picked up at school and from their associates. She disliked to be all the time correcting them, and so she induced the family to organize the "slang collection box." Each person who used a slang expression instead of good English was required to drop a penny into this box. The contents were to be applied to a babies' hospital in which the family was interested. Pennies dropped in rapidly at first, but it was not long before there was such a general improvement in the language used in that home that the boy said to his mother, "The

babies will have to go hungry if they depend on our box for support." Tactful measures had succeeded.

A little girl returned to her humble home in a New England city from the college settlement, and said of her new teacher: "She's a perfect lady, that's what she is!"

"How do you know?" asked the doubtful mother. "You've known her only two days."

"It's easy enough telling," answered the child. "I know she's a perfect lady, because she makes you feel polite all the time."

Some boys in a country school had agreed not to bring any wood into the schoolroom. The teacher knew their attitude in the matter, but did not attempt to argue with them, and acted as if she were ignorant of their agreement. One morning she said: "I know that John will be glad to go and bring in some wood for the fire." John, as a matter of fact, had made up his mind not to do this very thing, but he was unable to resist when the teacher spoke as if she had absolute confidence in his willingness to bring in the wood. Had she commanded John, at that time, he would have been stubborn and sullen; but he "could not resist gentleness and kindness."

Tact is most valuable in the various relations in which men stand to their fellows. Popularity and success depend upon it, as well as the happiness of others. Admiral Nelson was in a naval hospital at Yarmouth, England, on one occasion, and there saw a disabled sailor. The man had lost his right arm. Nelson looked at his own empty sleeve, then glanced at the sailor, and pleasantly said, "Well, Jack, then you and I are spoiled for fishermen; but cheer up, my brave fellow, we'll never see you starve."

A waitress said to a lady at the breakfast table: "How do you prefer your egg this morning?" After the waitress retired, the lady turned to a friend at the table and remarked, "What a difference in the way a question is put! If she had said, 'Will you have an egg?' or 'You will not care for an egg this morning?' I should have said, 'No.' But when she put the question in that form, what could I answer but, 'Soft boiled, please?'"

The fine art of living agreeably with folks, most of whom have a good deal of human nature with its peculiarities, is one worth cultivating. President Charles F. Thwing has said: "In the spring of 1906 there died one of the more conspicuous officers of Harvard College, Professor Nathaniel Southgate Shaler. On the afternoon of his funeral the shops in old Cambridge were shut, an honor that had not been paid to any other Harvard College professor for many years. Professor Shaler was a Kentuckian. It has been said that when he came to Harvard College, and for a long time afterward, the 'faculty was chiefly composed of men who had had Harvard training and were typical New Englanders. He brought with him the traditions of another civilization, of more genial manners, and of more outspoken opinions. In the Civil War he had fought for the Union, but half of his people were Confederates. So he learned early to steer his course amid two conflicting systems, and, above all, to get on with men of antagonistic principles.'"

Gilder paid a splendid tribute to Grover Cleveland when he said, concerning the statesman:

His was the sweetness of the strong! His voice  
Firm with the powerful, gentle with the weak,  
Took tenderness in speech with little folk,  
And he was pitiful of man and brute.

Tact may find its place even in the administration of a rebuke, as the following incident, told on good authority, will indicate: "The carriage of Queen Victoria of Spain was checked for a moment by the crowded street, and she was at once the target for all eyes as she sat, waiting quietly. Wishing to examine more closely the beautiful embroidered garment which the queen was wearing, an American lady raised, impulsively, an opera glass which she was carrying and scanned the queen closely, although only a few feet apart. Suddenly, to her dismay, she was brought to the realization of her extreme rudeness by meeting the queen's eyes full in the glass—eyes that spoke the rebuke plainly, although the steady look was kind and patient. Instantly the glass was lowered, and, with scarlet cheeks, the lady's face expressed an unmistakable apology, as Queen Victoria raised a mildly reproving forefinger and shook her head slightly, with a little smile, as the carriage moved on."

The business man knows the value of tact. One such said that his establishment aimed to make a friend of every customer, and that his house cannot afford to lose a customer's good will. Even if a customer is lost, the house does not wish him to leave as an enemy. Every effort is made to make the customer feel that he has been fairly dealt with. Hence, that house is willing to exchange an article months after it is bought if the purchaser finds that it is not what it was represented to be. John Wanamaker said to his employees: "When a customer enters my store, he is king. Forget me." James C. Colgate recently addressed the students of Colgate University, of which he is a trustee, and advised the students to endeavor to understand human nature. "When one wants to persuade his fellow man," said he, "he must first agree with him. By coming to an agreement with him, one can meet him on the same ground, and one can hope to persuade him to one's mind."

Tact clinches the bargain,  
Sails out of the bay,  
Gets the vote in the Senate,  
Spite of Webster or Clay.

Efficiency of leadership depends on tact. "Too many through want of prudence are golden apprentices, silver journeymen, and bronze masters." Yet, perhaps it is well to remember that "the tactful man is not a weak man, who is ready to agree with anybody and everybody for the sake of being pleasant. Rather, he is a strong man, who is able to make other people quite readily agree with him." But Charles Sumner Ward gave a most excellent bit of advice to the collectors who were assisting him in raising a large sum of money for the Young Men's Christian Association

in London during the early days of 1912, when he said, "As to the method of canvassing, always take pains to leave the man feeling well."

The religious worker, especially, is constantly in need of tact, which is "the knack of handling people." He was a tactful preacher, in a certain town in the West, of whom it is said that he met a man with whom he was well acquainted coming out of a saloon rather the worse for drink. With rare tact the preacher cheerily said, "John, I'm glad to see you. I'd rather see you coming out of that place than going in." The man knew well enough what the preacher meant, but he could take no offense. Tactful words were worth far more than sharp reproof at that moment.

"Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you? Let him show out of a good conversation his works with meekness of wisdom. . . . But the wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, and easy to be intreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality, and without hypocrisy" (James 3. 13-17).

Of tact, as well as of courtesy, it may be said:

It transmutes aliens into trusting friends,  
And gives its owner passport round the globe.

Utica, N. Y.

WILLIAM J. HART.



## THE ITINERANTS' CLUB

## PAUL'S EXPOSITION OF CHRISTIANITY—(Continued)

In the previous discussion Paul has shown that man is destitute of personal righteousness and therefore has no claim to the favor of God. The law demands absolute obedience in all its parts, both in letter and in spirit, if one would be justified by legalism. It is clear from the statements of the apostle in the early part of the Epistle to the Romans that he recognizes no such just person: "All have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God." Hence in the way of legalism, either ceremonial or moral, there is no hope for man. Jesus Christ, however, came into the world and through his death made possible the salvation of man. All who believe in Christ are "justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts 13. 39. The classical passage, however, referring to the attainment of God's righteousness apart from the law, is found in the third chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, verses 21-26: "But now apart from the law a righteousness of God hath been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; 22 even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ unto all them that believe; for there is no distinction; 23 for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God; 24 being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; 25 whom God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith, in his blood, to show his righteousness because of the passing over of the sins done aforetime, in the forbearance of God; 26 for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season: that he might himself be just, and the justifier of him that hath faith in Jesus." A brief analysis will show its importance for the comprehension of Paul's philosophy of Christianity.

He assures us that a righteousness of God apart from the law has been manifested to the world. The language is, "a righteousness of God," which assumes that it is a different kind of righteousness from a legal righteousness, namely, a righteousness which God has provided for man. He further says that this righteousness has not only been manifested to man in the coming of Jesus Christ, but also has been testified to by the law and the prophets. By the law and the prophets, of course, are meant the Old Testament scriptures, which foretell this new righteousness and prepare the way for it. Hence it will be noted that in Stephen's appeal before the Jewish Sanhedrin, and in Paul's appeal before his countrymen, they affirm that the doctrines which they proclaim have their roots in the Old Testament scriptures. This, of course, would be a valid argument to anyone by whom the Old Testament dispensation was recognized as of divine authority.

He next proceeds to define this righteousness. He says not only that it is a righteousness of God, but that it is a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ; that is, it is appropriated through faith and becomes

the possession of the believer. He also declares righteousness of this kind is necessary for all people because there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile; "all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God." This leads him, further, to state that this new righteousness of God is justification, that is, it is a righteousness in which the person is set right before God; a righteousness which is an act that is given, not earned, because, in the language of the apostle, "man is justified freely," and, as he expresses it in another place, it is a "gift." We have the terminology often used in theological thought, "the doctrines of grace," meaning thereby that the whole redemptive scheme through Jesus Christ is gracious, not legal. What a man secures by his own obedience he earns, and it belongs to him as a matter of right and not as a matter of grace; but this righteousness which is given by God is a gracious bestowment for which man is indebted to God. This gratuitous justification is secured for us "through the 'redemption' that is in Christ Jesus." The word "redemption" is, of course, one of the great significant terms of Pauline thought. Primarily it means deliverance by the payment of a ransom, that is, a certain price has been set upon his deliverance, and this price having been paid the condemned man is set free. This word will be found in Matthew 20. 28, "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." Again, in Ephesians 1. 7: "In whom we have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, according to the riches of his grace." In both passages it is clear that the deliverance was secured by a satisfaction to God, against whom man sinned, but there are passages also that indicate that the term redemption applied merely to the act of deliverance. We are not concerned, however, with the precise theological terminology; we are concerned only with the fact that it is deliverance provided for man through the sacrificial death of Jesus Christ. In Chapter 3. 25 the apostle indicates that Christ Jesus is to be set before the world to be a propitiation, or, as some would render it, a "propitiatory"; a propitiatory sacrifice. Here arises a question that Sanday, in his commentary on Romans 5. 10, discusses with much clearness. It is with reference to the word reconciliation. "What does reconciliation mean? Is it a change in the attitude of man to God or of God to man? Many high authorities claim that it is only a change in the attitude of man to God." Sanday, however, claims that the one to be propitiated is God. "There is frequent mention of the anger of God as directed against sinners, not merely at the end of all things, but also at this present time (Romans 1. 18, etc.). When that anger ceases to be so directed there is surely a change (or what we should be compelled to call a change) on the part of God as well as of man. We infer that the natural explanation of the passages which speak of enmity and reconciliation between God and man is that they are not on one side only, but mutual. At the same time we are aware that this is only an imperfect way of speaking. We are obliged to use anthropomorphic expressions, which imply a change of attitude or relation on the part of God as well as of man."

The point, however, upon which Paul insists is that the propitiation

is in Christ's blood, showing that his death constitutes the essence of his propitiation and that with reference to man it is to show Christ's righteousness; that is, that the voluntary sacrifice of Christ for human sin sets before the world all God's abhorrence of sin, and all its fearful results, and the powerful deliverance wrought by Christ from sin and its penalty. But he also shows that this propitiation has no reconciling force unless the one who claims it receives it through faith. This propitiation and acceptance of it through faith have two effects. It is a passing over, a "temporary withholding of judgment," for the sins that were committed under the old dispensation, and through it the sins of the ages have been propitiated or atoned for, thus setting forth the ground for the forbearance of God toward all sinners under both the old covenant and the new.

There can be no doubt that in this elaborate Epistle Paul carefully weighed every word, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and the passage under consideration has called for the exegetical skill of the foremost scholars. Selections from three of the great English commentators will show minute points of difference and yet general points of agreement. The importance of the subject and the eminence of the interpreters from whom the quotations are taken will justify, we hope, the length of the citations.

In reviewing his discussion of chapter 3, 21-26, Beet says: "Through the gospel announced by Christ, God has, apart from obedience to law and from natural distinctions, manifested a righteousness which is his own gift to all believers. Such was needed: for all have sinned, and are thus destitute of the heritage of glory which belongs to the sons of God. This gospel implies justification by God's free favor, and this is itself a proof of the moral failure of our race, a proof strengthened by the assertion of Paul that it was made possible only through the death of Christ. This last was therefore the ransom-price of our salvation. The payment was made, and liberation takes place, in him who was born at Bethlehem to be our King. Because no other means would avail God set him forth 'before the eyes of men, covered with his own blood, to be a propitiatory sacrifice sheltering from punishment due to their sins those who believe. God did this in order thus to afford proof of his own righteousness, a proof made needful by his own past forbearance and his present purpose to proclaim pardon for those who believe the words of Jesus. To delay punishment, and still more to pardon the guilty, by mere prerogative, is unjust, and therefore impossible to God. But that which by itself would have been unworthy of a righteous ruler God has harmonized with his own absolute justice by the demonstration of it given in the death of Christ."

Sanday paraphrases this passage, 21-26, thus: "21. It is precisely such a method which is offered in Christianity. We have seen what is the state of the world without it. But now, since the coming of Christ, the righteousness of God has asserted itself in visible concrete form, but so as to furnish at the same time a means of acquiring righteousness to man—and that in complete independence of law, though the sacred books which

contain the law and the writings of the prophets bear witness to it. 22. This method of acquiring righteousness does not turn upon righteousness but on faith; that is, on ardent attachment and devotion to Jesus Messiah. It is therefore no longer confined to any particular people, like the Jews, but is thrown open without distinction to all on sole condition of believing, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. 23. The universal gift corresponds to the universal need. All men alike have sinned; and all alike feel themselves far from the bright effulgence of God's presence. 24. Yet, estranged as they are, God accepts them as righteous, for no merit or service of theirs, but by an act of his own free favor, the change in their relation to him being due to the great deliverance wrought at the price of the death of Christ Jesus. 25. When the Messiah suffered upon the Cross it was God who set him there as a public spectacle, to be viewed as a Mosaic sacrifice might be viewed by the crowds assembled in the courts of the temple. The shedding of his blood was in fact a sacrifice which had the effect of making a propitiation or atonement for sin, an effect which man must appropriate through faith; the object of the whole being by this public and decisive act to vindicate the righteousness of God. In previous ages the sins of mankind had been passed over without adequate punishment or atonement: 26. But this long forbearance on the part of God had in view throughout the signal exhibition of his righteousness which he purposed to enact when the hour should come, as now it has come, so as to reveal himself in his double character as at once righteous himself and pronouncing righteous or accepting as righteous the loyal follower of Jesus."

Vaughan 3. 21-26: "This was all that law could do—the Law of Moses, or any law: it could point out sin, but could not clear from sin: but now apart from any law, a righteousness of God—not of man's making, but of God's giving—has been manifested, testimony being borne to it by the law and the prophets: there is no conflict between the gospel and the Old Testament; on the contrary, the Old Testament, when read aright, as it can now be read, is a witness to the gospel: a righteousness, I say, of God, wrought out, in each individual instance, by means of faith in Christ; a righteousness reaching to all who so believe; all indiscriminately; for there is no difference; all alike, Jews and Gentiles, need this new gift; for all alike sinned in their old state, and are missing the glory of God—that state of final perfection which God has from the beginning designed for man: all alike need, and all alike may have; being made righteous, cleared from guilt, not by any merit of theirs, but gratuitously, by the free favor of God, through that redemption which is in Christ Jesus, whom God proposed to himself in his eternal counsels, as a propitiation, to be made available by means of faith; a propitiation to be effected in (through) his blood; proposed to himself, I say, for, declaration of his righteousness—that God might declare in him his own gift of righteousness to man—because of the remission—a righteousness owing to (originating in) the letting go, the disregarding, the dismissal—of all past sins in (through) the forbearance of God; with a view, I say, to that declaration of his righteousness in the present season, unto his being—so that God

may be both righteous and the giver of righteousness to him who is of faith in Jesus Christ."

There is one point at the close of this passage (3. 26) which the commentators seem to have overlooked, namely, its practical bearing: "for the showing, I say, of his righteousness at this present season." The Apostle Paul was not a mere theorist; he was setting forth the divine plan of human redemption. His doctrines were at once profound and practical. While he was interested in the dialectics of his subject, the supreme motive which dominated him was his passion for the souls of men. His gospel was a gospel for his age and for all ages. If one will compare the age of Saint Paul with present-day conditions he will find much that is common to both. Sin still calls for forgiveness, man still needs holiness more than anything else, the Cross is still the great attraction for the pilgrim seeking rest—"and I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me"—heaven still beckons believers away from the sordid pleasures of earth. Paul's gospel is always for the "present season," it never gets out of date. It is always the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.

Paul's message in the gospel of the atonement which we have been considering is for all ages and for all peoples.

The teaching of this passage is the keynote of redemption and excludes all human glorying. "Where, then, is the glorying? It is excluded. By what manner of law? of works? Nay; but by a law of faith." He then affirms his great proposition, "We reckon therefore that man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law."



## ARCHÆOLOGY AND BIBLICAL RESEARCH

## RECENT EXPLORATIONS IN JERUSALEM

THERE has always been a legend connecting the temple at Jerusalem with vast treasures securely hidden in a secret subterranean chamber. Indeed, the common Moslems in and around the Holy City have ever believed that the sacred site on which the temple stood was a depository not only of sacred vessels and furniture, but of untold quantities of silver, gold, and precious stones. Such an opinion, shared by some scholarly men in various lands and ages, is not difficult to explain when we recall that temples in many countries were receptacles for treasure of all kinds. Our museums are filled with articles of great value discovered in temples and tombs.

This belief explains, at least in part, the recent explorations in Jerusalem. It is more than probable that the stock company, with a capital of nearly \$125,000, organized by Captain Parker for the purpose of making excavations under the supposed site of the temple of Solomon—where King David was said to have been buried—had fully expected to discover valuable treasures, at least more than enough to reimburse the amount expended.

Though practically nothing is known of the final result of this work, which was carried on for so long a time with utmost secrecy, the American and European papers and magazines have had much to say about Captain Parker and his collaborators, and the mysterious operations outside and inside the Haram inclosures. As is, alas! too often the case, the reporters and correspondents of even reputable papers have drawn too largely upon their fertile imaginations and have written exaggerated reports of the "wonderful discoveries" in the vaults and subterranean passages of the holy place. The reports given the press were not furnished by those in command of the expedition, for, as far as we know, little or nothing was made public, and thus a free rein was given to the superstitious and bigoted imagination of the natives. For these it was enough to know that a company of "unbelievers" (Christians) were engaged in ransacking and plundering the most sacred edifice in Jerusalem. This was bad enough, but the idea that such work of desecration was carried on with the approval and protection of the Turkish authorities was more than the faithful could stand. No wonder, therefore, that the whole thing came to such an untimely and ignominious end on the twelfth day of April, 1911, when the foreigners in charge left Jerusalem with precipitous haste, boarded a yacht which was ready for them at Jaffa, and then put out to sea. The natives or Turkish officers who shared the secret were not as fortunate in escaping, for some of them were arrested, bound in chains and taken before a high Turkish tribunal at Beirut. Even the governor of Jerusalem, though not proven to be directly implicated, lost his official head—thankful, no doubt, that the head which nature gave him is still upon his shoulders.



With this introduction let us return to the excavations.

Some four years ago a Swedish resident of Belgium was sent to Jerusalem by a rich company of Englishmen. It now appears that this Swede claimed that he had discovered a code or a cipher which furnished a key to the exact location of the underground recess where the treasures of the ancient temple had been deposited. Whether this was a case of credulity or a species of deception pure and simple is difficult to decide. For it is never quite easy to distinguish between fanaticism, delusion, and base imposture. It is a matter of regret that, though the Englishmen at the head had money in abundance, they had no experience, either as archaeologists or as excavators. Indeed, they seemed adverse to any experienced aid, at least from English scholars. They did finally allow the Dominican Fathers of the *École Biblique et Archéologique*, Jerusalem, to visit the places explored. One of these Fathers, Hugues Vincent, has published his *Underground Jerusalem*, in which he discusses some of the work done by Captain Parker and his colleagues. This volume has little that is really new, and on the whole it is somewhat disappointing. A reviewer of this little book says: "Warren's Survey has been used for the purpose of the expedition under consideration—both plan and complete section of the Siloam Tunnel. Indeed, Plan V is a reproduction of these, and one must remark that in all the plans the distinction between what had already been surveyed by this recent expedition is not made sufficiently clear. The reader who has not already informed himself on the subject would be apt to suppose that much more was due to the expedition now described than is, in fact, the case. It must also be noted that the references from the texts to the plans are difficult to follow."

Those familiar with archaeological research in Jerusalem will recall that Captain Warren of the British Army discovered in 1867 a shaft not far from the Fountain of the Virgin. This was descended at the time and the tunnels leading from it were followed as far as possible, but without any important discovery. Several others, since that time, including the well-known French archaeologist, Clermont-Ganneau, have spent much time and money in the attempt to wrest from these subterranean caverns and passages any secrets which they might have to disclose. But secrets and treasures have been equally scant. When we remember that treasure-hunters of many nationalities and several creeds have ransacked these same sacred spots, time and again, there is no probability that anything in silver or gold or of commercial value will ever be unearthed.

The air of secrecy surrounding these excavations was the immediate occasion of innumerable wild and exaggerated statements. Not only was it said that rich booty had been found by Captain Parker, but it was also asserted that he had carried away with him the crown of David, the sword of Solomon, the Tables of the Law, etc. It was also reported that the Ark of the Covenant and several sacred vessels had been brought to light.

The legend regarding the temple treasure was partly based upon the current belief that David and other kings of Israel had been buried in crypts within the temple area, and that, in accordance with the custom

in vogue in many countries, vast treasures had been deposited with the bodies in the royal sepulchers.

There can be no doubt, explain it as we may, that the English excavators had expected a rich return for the twenty-five thousand pounds expended by the company in these recent explorations. If, then, an educated army officer could have been led to expect financial returns we can readily comprehend how the ignorant, fanatical Moslems could exaggerate the commercial value of the supposed treasure unceremoniously rushed away from Jerusalem to Jaffa, and then by sea to some safe place.

The popular excitement is more readily understood when we are told that there were in Jerusalem at this crucial point a throng of pilgrims in attendance upon the Feast of Moses. Pilgrims attending sacred feasts at the most sacred spot in Palestine are usually the possessors of more zeal than knowledge. Such people can never understand the unselfishness of Christians from Europe engaged in excavation in Turkey. They cannot conceive why Englishmen or Germans should spend their money lavishly merely for educational and cultural purposes. They cannot be made to realize the scientific value of explorations. No matter how unselfishly and honorably conducted, the ignorant native Moslem can see only avarice and greed in what they honestly regard as mere treasure hunting.

The expedition under consideration was shrouded in mystery from the very beginning. The utmost secrecy prevailed at every step, and that with the connivance of the local authorities. Unfortunately, it is known that large sums were paid in cash to government officials. The whole thing is to be regretted, for it has necessarily given a check to archaeological research in Palestine for the immediate future. In the meantime we shall patiently wait for Captain Parker's report, for he speaks of "unique finds."

Professor Dalman has written an article in the *Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, which has been translated for the last number of the Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Professor Dalman says:

"The treasure hunt has failed, but the following unfortunate results remain:

"1. The people of Palestine have been confirmed in their belief that archaeological researches are really treasure hunts.

"2. The Moslems have come to the conclusion, which it will be difficult to remove, that one of their holiest places has been pillaged by the Christians.

"3. The confidence of the Turkish government in exploration societies, that they will not do that which is unlawful, has been shaken.

"4. The Sacred Rock in the Haram inclosure has been made inaccessible to visitors, and every step of Europeans in the vicinity of it is carefully watched.

"5. One may therefore say that the treasure hunt of Captain Parker has checked scientific research in Palestine, and it is not probable that the results of his discoveries will compensate for this loss. We wish

especially to emphasize the fact that we do not seek for treasure, and will always be anxious to work in loyal coöperation with the Turkish government, and with careful consideration for the feeling of Moslems."

#### A NEW COPTIC LIBRARY

From a paper read by Professor Henri Hyvernât, of Washington, D. C., at the last meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in New York city, we learn of a most interesting discovery in the southwestern part of the Fayum, Egypt, where nearly two years ago some Arab treasure hunters succeeded in bringing to light more than threescore Coptic manuscripts. They were found in the ruins of an old Coptic Christian monastery named for and dedicated to the archangel Michael. Dates on some of these indicate they were executed between 825 and 1000 A. D.

Nearly a dozen of these documents, written perhaps by Alexandrian monks, are short biographies of saints and martyrs. We find, too, a dictionary, a prayer book, and some church music. The greater, and by far the more valuable, portion of this ancient collection consists of biblical texts, including considerable portions of the Old Testament, and, if we except Revelation, the entire New Testament. The fact that the Apocalypse, the last book received into the New Testament canon, is not included, favors the conclusion that we have here a Coptic version of an early date—made, most probably, from the Septuagint not later than A. D. 200. If this inference be correct these manuscripts recently discovered will prove of great value to students in textual criticism.

These documents, perhaps the oldest in the Coptic language, are beautifully written; the script is clear and bold. The ornamentations and illuminations are numerous and display a fair knowledge of art. Nor should we fail to notice the fine specimen of the book-binder's work—for these volumes are in elegant leather binding.

The Coptic, the immediate successor of the Egyptian, is usually made to include three dialects: The Behaine, the Fayumic, and the Sahadic, spoken in Lower, Middle, and Upper Egypt, respectively. With the exception of a few notes and colophons, this entire library is in the Sahadic. This makes the discovery so much the more valuable, because the bulk of Coptic literature so far discovered had been in the other two dialects.

This entire library has been purchased by Mr. John Pierpont Morgan and deposited, with other art and literary treasures, in the great Museum at New York, destined one day to be one of the greatest in the world.

The fact that the task of editing these manuscripts has been intrusted to Dr. Hyvernât, without doubt one of the best Coptic scholars living, is a sufficient guarantee that the work will be well done. Not only have we a right to expect much light upon the Coptic language and church history, but also some valuable help in New Testament textual criticism.

Professor Hyvernât expresses the opinion that these manuscripts acquired by Mr. Morgan possess greater value than all other Coptic literature put together. If this be true, New York may, from this time on, become the great center for the study of Coptic.

## BOOK NOTICES

## RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE

*Growth of the Missionary Concept.* By JOHN F. GOUCHER. 12mo, pp. 202. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. Price, cloth, 75 cents, net.

THESE five remarkable lectures were delivered at Syracuse University on the Nathan Graves Foundation, and have been given in other places. In the introduction Chancellor James R. Day says: "Few men are as able and as qualified by travel and personal observation to discuss the mission fields of the world as Dr. Goucher. His lucid style, convincing logic, and absorbed interest in missions invest these lectures with peculiar interest and value for all who wish to study the subject of missions in its broadest philosophical and practical aspects." That is a very mild and moderate statement of fact. This lecturer on missions is so completely saturated with his divine Master's own spirit, surcharged with the missionary passion, and so fully informed about his subject, that it is difficult to imagine any lifelong foreign missionary writing more ardently or irresistibly. The book is more fascinating than a novel can be. In it the record of actual history wears the splendor of romance. In it we behold in our own time the wonderful works of God. The book is a mighty quickener of faith in God. We see him working out his purposes through men and women willing to be his agents. The reality and perfectness of divine Providence, as concentered in the life of Robert Morrison, is set forth by Dr. Goucher with a convincingness which is simply overwhelming, filling the heart of the Christian with wonder, love, and praise. When we listened at Drew Theological Seminary to this story from the inspired lips of Dr. Goucher it seemed to us an inescapable and irresistible demonstration of the presence of God in human affairs, the power of the living and loving Christ in the progress of his campaign for saving the world. Hear the spirit of young Morrison when friends dissuaded him from giving his life to foreign missions and his fiancée cast him off because of his determination: "O how great is that God in whom I trust! How able to deliver! My soul, rest on God in Christ, as thine only hope and portion"; and to a friend he wrote: "It is the great business of our lives to testify the gospel of the grace of God." He asked that he might be stationed "in that part of the missionary field where difficulties were greatest and apparently most insurmountable." On this Dr. Goucher comments: "This spirit is precious to God, highly appreciated among men, and the sure token of great usefulness. He who covets immunity from difficulties is bidding for discouragement and planning for defeat. Any person can do an easy thing. God is seeking for men, courageously obedient men, to whom he may intrust his high commissions. The only thing in the whole universe difficult for God Almighty to do is to find a

man responsive and thoroughly loyal, willing to meet the full responsibilities of a man, faithfully obedient to divine direction. When he does find one, and the divine purpose has opportunity to manifest itself through human obedience, God's plans unfold as silently as thought and as irresistibly as destiny." This book enables us to see his plans unfolding, and persuades us that "History is mystery unless read as His story." Dr. Goucher tells how Judson Wright Collins became our first Methodist Episcopal missionary to China: "While he was yet a child his parents moved to Ann Arbor, in the State of Michigan, and in the winter of 1837-38, when he was fourteen years of age, an event occurred in the life of young Collins which was of transcendent importance for time and eternity. Under the ministry of the Rev. E. H. Pilcher, Collins was converted. Do you appreciate what being converted means? It means being changed; it means being transformed by the Incoming of the Holy Spirit; it means being made a partaker of the nature of God, so that he who is converted loves as God loves, and hates what God hates, seeks the things God seeks, and resists the things God resists. The conversion of young Collins was thorough, like that of Saul of Tarsus, and when the power of God came upon him he was regenerated in the likeness of God. He became a replica of the incarnation, and shared with Christ his divine hunger for souls which grew with his growth and strengthened with his strength." God laid China on the heart of this young man. He offered himself to Dr. Durbin, who replied: "Our church has no work in China, and that land is not open to missionaries." Nothing daunted, young Collins wrote to Bishop Janes: "Engage me a place as a common sailor before the mast, and my own strong arm will pull me to China and support me while there." Fitly does Dr. Goucher write: "God is not gathering a community of weaklings and cowards, characterized by indecision and timidity, but God is building a kingdom of men, of just men, of just men made perfect, who count not their lives dear unto themselves, but who, like their Lord, for the joy set before them endure the cross, despising the shame. Jesus Christ never hides his scars when he seeks for loyalty; he never promises ease to those whom he invites to companionship. The moral solvent of this world is not rose water, but good red blood, warm and vital. With the assurance that all authority is given unto him in heaven and on earth, Christ promises all who loyally keep company with him that they shall be brought off more than conquerors, not through their own prowess, but through him who hath loved them, and given himself for them. Through persecution they must grow in the knowledge of God and the love of Jesus, which comes as the most precious of gifts and bides as the supreme command." The following incident of missionary work in New Zealand is given: "The Lord's Supper was being celebrated. The first rank having knelt, a native rose up and returned to his seat, but again came forward and knelt down. Being questioned, he said: 'When I went to the table I did not know whom I would have to kneel beside, when suddenly I saw by my side the man who a few years before slew my father and drank his blood, and whom I then devoted to death. Imagine what I felt when I suddenly found



him by my side. A rush of feelings came over me that I could not endure, and I went back to my seat. But when I got there I saw the upper sanctuary, and the great supper, and thought I heard a voice, saying, "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another." That overpowered me. I sat down and at once seemed to see another vision of a cross with a Man nailed to it, and I heard him cry, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." Then I returned to the altar." Writing of India, Dr. Goucher asks how the religion of Christ affects the native heathen and whether it can do anything for them. He answers that as food relieves hunger, as light pleases the eye, as music brings its joyful harmonies to the responsive soul, Christianity is suited to their every need, and then he gives a typical incident. "Jacob Jacobs was the son of a pariah, an outcast, a scavenger. Going along the street when a little fellow, about four years of age, he passed a Sunday school and heard the singing. Attracted by the music, he stopped to listen, and the teacher, seeing his interest, asked him to come in. He was clothed in the inadequate fold of a single string about his waist, and he went into a Sunday school where all the children under six years of age wore nothing but their complexions, decorated occasionally with a smile. There they sat and smiled and wondered, and were instructed in the truths revealed in the Bible. His teacher asked him to come the next Sunday, which he did, and the next, and many more, and they persuaded him to attend the mission day school. He was responsive and industrious, and acquired a knowledge of the things that were being taught—simple fundamentals of education, together with the profound truths of Christ. A child can grasp these to the extent of its needs as well as a philosopher, and even better. So this son of a poor outcast passed from form to form, through the primary to the secondary school, and completed the course in the high school with a substratum of gospel truth underlying his education, to which the Holy Spirit gave his vitalizing power, and Jacob was transformed into the likeness of the Son of God. The Hindu religion had stamped him an outcast because his father had been born an outcast, and within human power that stamp was indelible; but through the quickening of the Holy Spirit he became a joint heir with Jesus Christ. In the power of his newly found life, master of himself, he passed on to and through the government school, and after some experience in teaching he was made head master in the mission high school at Moradabad. There was a wonder in India: Jacob Jacobs, the son of a pariah, had become transformed, conscientious, industrious, cultured, capable, alert, because love dominated his heart, substituted hope for fear, begat within him definiteness of purpose, keenness of interest, responsiveness, resourcefulness, and consecration to the highest ideal. It came to pass after a very few years that every boy who went up from that school passed the government examinations. It occurred the next year also. That was very unusual, and presently it was bruited about the city that for two years every boy who had been recommended from the Moradabad high school had passed the government examinations. There were some Brahman and Moham-



medan teachers in that city who said, 'This will never do; we must undercut the influence of Jacobs or we will lose our patronage.' So they had some large placards printed in different colors, on which they stated that Jacobs was the son of an outcast, that if he should correct or touch a high-caste boy, the boy would lose his caste, the parents would suffer pollution also, and to prevent this dire result all high-caste boys ought to be withdrawn from the influence of the pariah teacher. These they had posted all through the city, and one was placed on each side of the door in the high school where Jacobs taught, so that every child who came that morning should see them. Jacob Jacobs had the third blessing. You have heard a great deal about the first blessing, so called, which is justification by faith; and the second blessing, so called, which is sanctification by the Spirit; but Jacobs possessed the third blessing. Some people try to get the second blessing before they get the first, but it never comes that way, and there are some people who get so much of the first, you could scarcely discover they have not the second; but Jacobs had the third blessing. The third blessing is very rare; sometimes it comes before the first, sometimes after the first, and before the second, and sometimes it comes after the second; frequently it never comes in this world at all. It is the blessing of common sense. Jacob Jacobs had a great, workable stock of this third blessing, common sense. When the Almighty finds a man who attains unto this third blessing he always has an agent through whom he does things; but even the Almighty has a hard time doing things which are worth while with a man who does not have common sense. Jacobs knew the limitations of his calling; he knew he was not set for the defense of himself; he knew he was set for the illustration of the gospel, and he knew also that the Lord would take care of him if he was faithful to his commission. He did not become angry and say, 'I am as good as the people who put up those posters.' Neither, in chagrin, did he tear his hair—that was worn short; and he would not have torn it if it had been long. Duty led him between those posters. There he went and opened his school as usual; for he knew it was written, 'Give place unto wrath. . . . Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord,' and he was sure the Lord would satisfy the claims of justice in mercy better than he could if he should undertake to do it himself. His commission was to illustrate his faith in God, by making his school a success. So he went in and taught his school as if nothing had occurred. School was dismissed; and he taught it the next day, and school was dismissed; and those posters disappeared about as they went up, he didn't know how. But the posters had made an impression; the Brahman and Mohammedan bankers, and other business men, the cultured and rich men of Moradabad, asked, 'Why are these posters abusing Jacob Jacobs placed all over the city at this time?' Others, whose sons were at the school, answered: 'Don't you know why that is? Jacob Jacobs is the head master of the Moradabad high school, and every boy he has sent up to the government examinations for the past two years has passed. The Brahman and Mohammedan teachers have put these posters up for fear all their pupils will go to

Jacobs' school.' And these shrewd business men said, 'You say every boy he sent up passed?' The reply was 'Yes.' 'Well,' they said, 'that is where we want our sons to go.' And its halls were soon crowded so that the school has been self-supporting ever since. The Lord would work many miracles of grace for us if we did not interfere and spoil his plan, that is, if we had common sense enough to do our allotted work faithfully, and let the Lord care for his servant in his own way." One of the most fully informed of world-experts on missions, recognized in many high councils and in many lands as a leader of extraordinary ability, experience, and wisdom, a man of vision, insight, and constructive Christian statesmanship, is John Franklin Goucher, the author of this book.

*The Theology of a Preacher.* By LYNN HAROLD HOUGH. 12mo, pp. 260. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. Price, cloth, \$1, net.

THE author of *The Lure of Books*, and of *Athanasius, the Hero*, is a man of avid reading through a wide range of literature, a man of rich and varied culture, but his chief intellectual interest is in the large, lofty, cosmic realm of systematic theology. The theology of this preacher is tinglingly, thrillingly alive. In this book, as in the pulpit, his message is expressed in vivid, arresting, and compelling words, and delivered with passionate intensity. All his conceptions are based firmly on the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. Through all his utterance in speech or print the note of redemption through Christ rings high and clear. This is what gives penetrating and prevailing power. These twenty brief, bright chapters are felicitously entitled: *The Significance of the Preacher's Own Experience; The Men among Whom He Lives; The Place of Christ; The Deed on Calvary; Salvation; A Christian Experience and the Rest of a Man's Life; The Regeneration of Society; The Far-Flung Battle Line; The Ceaseless Ministry of the Holy Ghost; The Church and the Christian Task; The Great Companionship; The God of the Preacher; The Practical Value of the Doctrine of the Trinity; The Preacher and Religious Authority; The Preacher and His Bible; Peering Into the Future; The Christian World-View.* This book was written with the burning conviction that the adequate preacher must be a preacher-theologian. It presents theology which can be preached and lived. Its mood is devotional. The author does not believe in writing about religion without being religious. He says: "The mood of this book is like the mood of the preacher—it is that of proclamation rather than argument. The test of the whole matter is not a detailed process of reasoning. At last, everything rests on whether what is said comes out of life and will eventuate in more life." A taste of these chapters will let our readers judge whether what we say of this book is true. The chapter on *The Supreme Tragedy* begins thus: "The preacher is sitting in his study at night. He feels drenched with the evil of the life of the man who has just left his house. He feels as if the man had left tracks of moral slime when he went away. The weariness of the day's work seems in some way to have departed. With brain moving with quick alertness and heart drawn by the passion and pain of it, the preacher

sits staring at sin. Kindly half-truths and apologetic compromising statements stand out in their poor inadequacy. With a relentless moral candor and a stern realism, his mind demands the whole truth. So with the stinging sense of contact with its shameful and brutal reality, the preacher works out his theology of sin. His first feeling is a consciousness that the men who spoke and wrote the great passages of the Bible felt about sin as he feels now. He turns to the fifty-first psalm and reads over the passionate cry of a stricken soul appalled at its own sinfulness. There he finds something which completely corresponds to the feeling in his own heart, and with all the memories that psalm arouses, there is a personal quality to the repulsion and horror with which he draws back from the full picture of sin which is forming itself in his mind. It is not simply the foe of the man who has just gone from his presence. It is his foe, too. And for a moment he seems to feel the hot breath of some beast of the forest against his face, so concrete has his thought become. There are some chemical reactions which are brought about only by the application of heat. You cannot think of sin calmly and at the same time think adequately. The heat of a mind alive to all its meaning is necessary for a man who would gain a true conception of sin. Of course it is necessary to make distinctions. There is a difference between sin and evil, though the one often expresses itself in the form of the other. Sin is intentional wrongdoing. Evil is wrongdoing whether it is intentional or not. Evil is often the result of heredity and environment, and not of personal intention. Sin always has personal intention behind it. The Bowery child, brought up in an atmosphere of moral loathsomeness, does a great many evil things without knowing that they are evil. It is quite possible that he swears with no more understanding of its wrongness than the parrot who repeats the oaths of a profane sailor. A great amount of the evil of the world is a crystallization of environment into the activity of the particular man. Perhaps some of the evil in the life of the depraved man who has just left the preacher's study was of this sort, but that was not the root of the man's condition. The preacher detected a slimy liking for evil in the man's eye, a certain foul at-homeness with vice, a certain leering personal intention which struck ice to his heart. If the man had been simply a victim, how easy it would have been to pity him! how easy it would have been to come close as a brother to help! But the citadel of the man's personality was wrong. He liked evil. He wanted evil. He disliked the discomfort which resulted from sin, but he was not at all alienated from sin itself. So the preacher faces the heart of the problem. Sin is personal commitment to evil." This chapter intensifies as it proceeds; it is poignant, radical, and solemnly convincing. The following is found in the heart of the chapter on The Goal of Sainthood: "When we come to analyze closely we find that sainthood includes some further characteristics. First. There is a certain ethereal purity of purpose. The saint's judgment may be confused. He may become perplexed and ignorantly fight on the wrong side in some great conflict, he may make all sorts of intellectual and practical mistakes, but his intention is nobly

right, and this glorified rightness of intention tends to make his mind do the very best and most dependable work of which his mind is capable. Second. He not only is filled with love to God and Christ, but he is filled with love to his fellow men. There is a certain deep personal responsiveness to human need which is a far finer thing than the zestful endeavor to be useful at the beginning of the Christian life. Training, environment, and other matters may interpose obstacles even now, but the heart has a deep hospitality for all human need. Third. There is a constantly growing sense of the reality of the things of the spirit. God and Christ and the Spirit's work have a certain conscious and constant validity. They have become the most real and possessing matters in all the world. Fourth. Deep in the life there is a steady and perennial drawing of energy from trust in Christ. The life has a great song of victory in it—the victory of a constant trust. Sainthood is not something with which the Saviour and his great sacrifice are remotely connected. It is the highest spiritual gift of the cross of Christ. Most Christians have known what it is to have snatches of the experience of sainthood. They remember all their lives the glow and wonder of the experience. It gives them a standard and an inspiration which are of untold value. But Christ came not that people might have glimpses of sainthood, and that a few elect souls might achieve its permanent glory. He came that all his children might attain to that life where loyalty is lost in love, where a perfect motive and a full devotion crown all the days. It may be a far call to these heights, but it is toward these heights we are climbing. If we ask how we shall know the way, there may be many things which are obscure, but there are some things which are clear. The deeper the consecration of a human life, the more it is really opened to the mighty work of the Saviour. Surely complete consecration is a door through which one must pass on his journey to this promised land. Then the deeper the realization that all spiritual grace is the gift of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, the more in a subtle way is the life attuned to true receptiveness. The more a man fills his mind and heart with the thought of the creative grace of God, the more will it become feasible for God to do great things for him. And added to consecration and an appreciative waiting for God's great gifts, there must surely be deep desire. A high discontent with less than the best God has to give must help to open the doors to the best. Blessed are all they who hunger and thirst after sainthood, for the desire is a prophecy of the fulfillment. So, giving ourselves more completely, believing in God's grace more deeply, aspiring with great personal longing for the triumph of love, we may work and wait and trust, and the God who desires to lead us each to the place of fullest Christian devotion will, in his own way, lead us to the heights of life. It may well be that the man who has reached the tablelands of peace and love will be thinking little about what he has attained. God delights to deliver his children from self-conscious sainthood. The dweller on the heights is likely to be too much preoccupied with the love of Christ to have much time to think of himself. He is still pressing on, loving, growing, serving, passing

into larger life and fuller experience all his days." The chapter on The Christian World-View culminates thus: "The final Christian contention as to a world-view is that sin and regeneration, a divine Christ, a redemptive deed on Calvary, and a new and triumphant life coming from the acceptance of the Christ of the cross are the cardinal and defining facts of human experience. Any world-view which leaves them out is simply failing to see what is most important in human life and experience. These conceptions and facts express that which corresponds to the reality of things. Their vitality is their protection and defense. No interpretation which ignores them can permanently secure itself. The facts are on the side of the evangelical interpretation of life. And in this is its perennial security." One who knows says that Lynn Harold Hough is such a preacher as is described by the whole of the first chapter of this book.

*The Inebelling Spirit.* By W. T. DAVISON, M.A., D.D., Principal of Richmond College, Surrey; Member of the Faculty of Theology and Examiner in Divinity in the University of London. 8vo, pp. x, 340. New York and London: Hodder & Stoughton. Price, cloth, \$1.50, net.

THE spring comes with abounding life to a depressed world. The air at once becomes resonant with song. The voice of melody is heard everywhere. Signs of green begin to appear and a varied beauty adorns the earth. A fragrance that is deliciously refreshing is enjoyed as we go forth after the long confinement. It is the presence and appearance of life that makes this difference. As we turn over the pages of the New Testament we are at once aware of the fact that the depression of a moral and spiritual winter such as rested upon the world of the first century has passed, and that the men and women of the primitive church were breathing a new atmosphere. Their confidence was boundless as they undertook to possess new fields in the name of the Lord Jesus. Their activities were increasing in the work of preaching the gospel of redemption. Their success was marvelous in inducing hundreds, yes, thousands, to join their company on confession of faith in Christ. What was the secret of this remarkable display of energy and endurance in the face of great odds? It was the realized presence of God in the Holy Spirit that gave them boldness, wisdom, faith, and love, and enabled them to become more than conquerors. This subject of the Holy Spirit is of vital importance, and any thorough treatment of it must be welcomed. It is both fitting and proper that a book dealing with this study should be written by a Methodist whose program is to spread scriptural holiness throughout the land. There is no Methodist leader on either side of the water who is more competent to undertake such a work of exposition and exhortation than the author whose volume is here noticed. He has occupied leading positions in the Wesleyan Methodist Church in Great Britain, and at the present time is the head of one of its important theological seminaries. His Fernley Lecture on The Christian Conscience, which was published in 1888, is still valuable as a contribution to Christian ethics. He has published many other



valuable books, including many articles in Hastings's Bible Dictionaries, notably a series on the apostle John and his writings. There is a subtle connection between his first mentioned book and this present study on the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit. The treatment is judicious, thorough, scholarly, and spiritual. The many-sided applications of this truth are strikingly delineated in the following words: "If the best results of modern scholarship are to be rightly appreciated and used; if mistaken traditions of ecclesiastical dogmatism are to be relinquished, without our falling into the vague unbelief of extreme rationalism; if in this generation any restatement—not reconstruction—of time-honored Christian doctrine is to be undertaken; if in these things there is to be liberty without laxity, authority without bondage, it can only be secured when the church, and especially its intellectual leaders, are filled with the influence of the ever-living, all-illuminating Spirit, who, amidst dangers, doubts, and difficulties innumerable will not suffer them to stray." The author declares that he has approached his subject from the side of experience. It cannot be adequately treated in any other way, for the things of the Spirit must be spiritually discerned. But this does not prevent him making a careful consideration and a keen criticism of philosophical world-views, like Naturalism and Pantheism, in their relation to Christian theism. It is unusual to find in a book on the Holy Spirit such discriminating allusions to the divers trends of current thought. And yet, if "the Holy Spirit is the self-communication of God, manifested in persons and producing a Divine-human life, which demonstrates itself" (Rufus M. Jones), it will follow that all the higher interests of life are manifestations of the Spirit, though they may be broken and defective. The chapter on the Holy Spirit in the New Testament recognizes the indispensable contribution of the Old Testament, and makes clear that the church of to-day, like the church of yesterday, can accomplish its superhuman tasks only as there is a renewal of the conscious realization of the divine presence. Other chapters deal with the Pauline psychology, the gifts and fruit of the Spirit, the tides of the Spirit, the Holy Spirit and Christian missions, a Spirit-filled church, the indwelling Christ, the hidden life, mystical religion. He speaks a necessary word of caution on mysticism, particularly as to its Pantheistic tendencies, but at the same time he strongly advocates its central place in Christianity. The gospel of Christ and him crucified is shown to meet all the needs of life. This is excellently illustrated from the First Epistle to the Corinthians. It would seem at the opening of this letter that the theme is narrowly restricted. "Yet before he has finished this one epistle he has soared to the heights of divine wisdom in chapter ii, he has dealt in fullest detail with social problems at Corinth in chapter vii, he has laid down far-reaching principles of Christian giving in chapter ix, has sung an immortal hymn of love in chapter xiii, has shown the value of gifts and graces in chapters xii and xiv, has penned lines of comfort and inspiration in chapter xv that have solaced mourners and relieved doubters for centuries." The evangel of salvation, when proclaimed in the plenitude of the Spirit, has always accomplished great things. It is well to



be reminded of our gracious Christian legacy, and to be encouraged to take full advantage of it. This is a timely utterance, charged with the spirit of earnestness and enlightenment. It cannot fail to purify the Christian temper, and enrich the Christian life, so that we may abound yet more in every good word and work.

*The Secret of the Lord.* By the Rev. W. M. Clow, B.D. 12mo, pp. 353. New York and London: Hodder & Stoughton. Price, cloth, \$1.50, net.

It is a great pleasure to read a volume of sermons on the Word of God where the text is not used as a pretext, but as the basis for unfolding the divine message. There is a way of insisting on conduct that leaves the man in the pew bewildered and weary. The better way is to remind him of the eternal foundations, and that the fountain of life is always available to furnish motive and momentum for the daily duties of life. This latter course has the fragrance of the evangel, and it has never been known to fail in offering enlightenment, giving encouragement, and imparting energy to do all the will of God. Let the pulpit follow this method and it will never cease to exercise a potent and persuasive influence. Professor Clow is favorably known by two volumes of sermons: *The Cross in Christian Experience* and *The Day of the Cross*. The volume under review maintains the excellent features of its predecessors. These sermons are based on the sayings and doings of Jesus during the days of a religious retreat held in the neighborhood of Caesarea Philippi (Matt. 16. 1 to 17. 21; Mark 8. 27 to 9. 29; Luke 9. 18-51). This call to come apart was given to the disciples at the summit level of Christ's ministry. It was the period of the transfiguration experience, when the shadow of the coming cross began to rest upon the soul of the Redeemer with increased impressiveness. The twenty-six sermons in this book are arranged under the following divisions: (1) the ruling law; (2) the disclosure of the person and his purpose; (3) the disclosure of the cross and its issues; (4) the disclosure of the glory and its significances; (5) the face toward Jerusalem; (6) the consummation of the secret. The subjects that were discussed by the Master on this occasion have a bearing on modern conditions in the church and in the world. Their import is set forth in these pages in a way that lays bare the hidden things of the heart. We learn wherein we are defective in the Christian experience, what is needed to enrich it, how the necessary stimulus and supply can be obtained. We are told about the imperious importance of quiet seasons of the soul, the urgent need for self-denial and sacrifice, the energy of prayer, and the secret of the victorious life. These are familiar themes, but they are discussed in a strikingly fresh and vigorous way. This preacher is familiar with the best thought in literature and theology, but he is not a copyist. He has worked out the material for himself and speaks with a note of authority that is spiritually compelling. He has drawn out of the undrained well of truth the water that has refreshed his own soul and which can quench the thirst of those who wait on his pulpit ministrations. Let a few sentences give an idea of the intrinsic merit of these discourses. He disputes the theory that the Jew had a

genius for religion, and denies that it is the privilege of any particular people. "Whenever the sense of need, and the compunction for wrong, and the craving to look into the unseen, have visited men, there is religion both possible and actual." "To be courteous to the rude, helpful to the unselfish, gentle to the insolent, quiet and self-possessed to the scornful and sarcastic, and patient with the erring, how few rise to these heights of self-abnegation!" "The saving of the soul is its renewal unto life, and its discipline unto godliness, and its exercise in the words and deeds of faith and charity." "The face is the involuntary and, at the last, the accurate index of the soul. A man may smile, and smile, and be a villain, through a few years of his life. But in the end let him pose and posture and dissemble as he will, what he has become in his soul is seen on his face. As surely as the sap wells up in the stem, and bursts out into leaf and blossom, and as certainly as the acid in a man's blood will be seen in the scab upon his skin, the passion of his soul renewed in hours of consecration will become the light and the line which all men's eyes can see." "Faith is a subtle contagion. As he comes into contact with the man or woman he trusts, the words spoken sink down into his heart, the prayers uttered become the liturgy of his petitions, the hopes which are his leader's motives make the young disciple's face to shine. There were men and women who felt that M'Cheyne's spiritual passion passed from him into their souls. There were devout believers who made long and costly journeys that they might be re consecrated by an hour in Spurgeon's presence. There were students trembling under their temptations who felt that Henry Drummond's influence was the elixir of life to their wills. Who has not known the man or woman, humble in station, undistinguished in gift, and yet so filled with the Spirit of God that to spend one hour with them was to receive a new energy for righteousness unto the soul?" The sermon is most impressive when it is delivered with extemporaneous unction, but never suppose that the thought and preparation can be extemporaneous. Give time and toll by study and prayer; you can then preach sermons, such as are found in this book, that will lead many on the uphill road to the City of God.

#### PHILOSOPHY, SCIENCE, AND GENERAL LITERATURE

*Ecce Homo.* By FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE. Translated by Anthony M. Ludovici. Crown 8vo, pp. 207. New York: The Macmillan Company. Price, cloth, with portrait, \$2, net.

HERE is a book from the borders of Bedlam, that region of hopeless unreason into the deep jungles of which the always wild author was finally lost to sight. It is Nietzsche's autobiography. Nietzsche's thinking in his books can be understood best by remembering that it is the flaming madness of a brain on fire. His fierce ravings against the wisdom of ages and all established things is like the snarling and snapping of a rabid dog. Toward all accepted and reverend views and institutions he rages like a mad Mullah. It is a characteristic of insanity to flout the real world, and assert instead delusions and lies. The amazing wonder is that books from Bedlam should be taken seriously

and the mutterings or shriekings of a bedlamite somnambulist talking his crazy dreams out on paper should be put in volumes as if they might contain supreme insight and wisdom. The article on Nietzsche in the eleventh edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* is far within the truth in saying that his philosophy is madness in the making. We should say that it is actual and full-developed madness attempting to philosophize. How utterly absurd it is for his admirers to tell us that this madman "actually accomplished the transvaluation of all values." They wish us to accept this preposterous egomaniac as they do, at his own boastful estimate of himself! One of them cautions us against undue haste in judging "this book with all its pontifical pride and surging self-reliance." It is not our fault that its vaunting and vaulting self-conceit and boastful self-assertion remind us of Walt Whitman's enormous egotism. Nietzsche's preface to his autobiography gets only through two sentences before he remarks upon "the smallness of my contemporaries" (was he looking at his admirers?) and cries, "For Heaven's sake, do not confound me with anyone else!" Also he thinks contemptuously of the men whom the past has reckoned great and ranked among the first of human kind. He says that when he compares with himself those whom the world has honored, he cannot reckon them as even human beings, but rather as "the excrements of mankind, and as products of disease, so many monsters laden with rottenness, so many hopeless incurables." The strutting and swelling braggadocio of this autobiography is unmatched in literature. It has chapters entitled "Why I Am So Wise," "Why I Am So Clever," "Why I Write Such Excellent Books," "Why I Am a Fatality." We are told that "modesty" and "humility" have to be enforced upon thousands of wretched nobodies to repress their vulgar pretensions; but that "modesty" and "humility" are not for "the truly great," such as he knows himself to be. His doctrine is that "Only nobodies are ever modest." Nietzsche saves us the trouble of calling him "a decadent," by acknowledging in his first chapter in this book that the decadent elements are present in him—elements of deterioration and decay. He says he would rather be a satyr than a saint. He says he cannot respect a god who has not a dash of the satyr in him. Naturally enough a gentleman with such preferences hates Christ and Christianity. He approves everything on which, hitherto, morality has set its ban; and those things are true and right, he holds, which, hitherto, have been most stringently forbidden. He says that his book, Zarathustra, is the greatest gift that has ever been bestowed upon men. It is "not only the loftiest book on earth but also the deepest, born of the inmost abundance of truth; an inexhaustible well, into which no pitcher can be lowered without coming up again laden with gold. . . . From out an infinite treasure of light my words fall out." His meaning is as crazy as his metaphor is mixed. He speaks of his great book as his "attempt to philosophize with a hammer." His impulse and purpose are to smash everything that mankind have valued, cherished, and revered. He must have been a queer, unnatural creature from his birth, for he writes: "I cannot recall one single happy reminiscence of my childhood and youth." Nobody has appeared in print in our time, if ever, so sadly and

totally warped and twisted, awry and askew, utterly upside down in all his thinking as this man. To him, pity seems a sign of weakness, and a sin, because it "makes a man break faith with himself" when a cry of distress reaches his ears; moreover he says "this gushing pity stinks of the mob." As he sees things, "so-called unselfish actions" are full of ignoble and short-sighted impulses. He says that "rudeness is one of our first virtues," that "it may be a joy to be wrong," that "great guilt endows one with privileges," that "if a god were to descend to this earth he could do nothing but wrong." There seems to be no limit to the phenomenal powers of this gifted and self-adorning "truly great man," as he calls himself. Even his physical senses are so acute, he tells us, that he "can ascertain physiologically—that is to say, can smell—the inmost core, the very 'entrails' of every human soul." And he adds: "This sensitiveness of mine is furnished with psychological antennæ, wherewith I feel and grasp every secret." It has always been difficult for him to keep from loathing mankind. "My relations with my fellows try my patience to no small extent," he says. As for himself, he lives upon the loftiest heights, above mankind, where he is "neighbor to the eagle, companion to the snow, and playmate of the sun"—so he tells us; and who should know, if he does not, where he lives? Naturally enough, this extremely unnatural German hates Germany and despises his fellow countrymen. He says that he and Heine are "by far the greatest artists of the German language that have ever existed"; "the Germans are *incapable* of conceiving anything sublime"; "wherever our Germany extends her sway she ruins culture." "The few instances of higher culture I have met in Germany were all French in their origin"; "German intellect took its origin in sadly disordered intestines—it is indigestion, it can assimilate nothing." He writes: "Even the presence of a German retards my digestion." The case of the Germans is so hopeless, so irremediable that Nietzsche cries out to them: "Ye lack two centuries of psychological and artistic discipline, my dear countrymen. But ye can never recover the time lost." He tells the Germans that every crime against culture for the last four centuries is chargeable to them. Why such a grudge against his own country? He betrays one reason of it, in this complaint: "I have been discovered everywhere else; but I have not yet been discovered in Germany, which is Europe's flat land." The Germans, it appears, are not aware of his transcendent greatness, will not read his books, have not discovered him. Perverse, stupid, brutish folk they are! How can he help hating and despising people who are indifferent to such books as his; books which he describes thus: "Other books simply cannot be endured after mine. Reading my works spoils a man's taste. It is an incomparable distinction to be allowed to cross the threshold of their noble and subtle world; in order to do so one must have deserved it, and must be not a German. He who is really related to me through loftiness of will, experiences genuine raptures in my books; for I swoop down from heights into which no bird has ever soared; I know abysses into which no foot has ever slipped. People have told me that it is impossible to lay down a book of mine—that I disturb even their night's rest." (This makes the prudence

of the Germans in abstaining from his books intelligible; a German must have his sleep.) He thinks those who do not like his books are "thoroughly vicious people, false from top to toe." Those who are not always of his opinion, though occasionally agreeing with him, are "cattle, mere Germans." The reader of his books, he says, needs to be "a monster of courage and curiosity, as well as of suppleness, cunning, and prudence—in short a born adventurer and explorer." He addresses himself to "daring experimenters, and to all who have ever embarked beneath cunning sails upon terrible seas; to those who revel in riddles and in twilight, whose souls are lured by flutes into every treacherous abyss." So he says; and if you are not of that sort, he is not speaking to you, you are not worth speaking to. Perhaps you do not know that there was no great literature until he came and made some. Listen: "Before my time people did not know what could be done with language. The art of grand rhythm, of grand style in periods, for expressing the tremendous fluctuations of sublime and superhuman passion was first discovered by me: in Zarathustra I have soared miles above all that which heretofore has been called poetry." This quite remarkable gentleman thinks himself a good deal of a "lady's man." Hear him: "I venture to suggest that I know women. May be I am the first psychologist of the eternally feminine. Women all like me. . . . Oh! what dangerous, creeping, subterranean little beasts of prey they are! And so agreeable withal! Woman is incalculably more wicked than man, she is also cleverer." Nietzsche calls Henrik Ibsen "that typical old maid." Luther is "that cursed monk." All this and many times as much of the same sort, and even wilder, may be found through seventy-six pages under his title, "Why I Write Such Excellent Books." And this entire autobiography is equally absurd and insane. This poor lunatic imagines he has wrecked the world—has "hurled a destructive thunderbolt which will send the whole of civilization into convulsions." He is, in Kipling's phrase, the "Prophet of the utterly Absurd." He thinks it inevitable that far on in the future years hymns will be sung in his memory. He says: "I am horribly frightened that one day I shall be pronounced 'holy.' I refuse to be a saint; I would rather be a clown. May be I am a clown." More ravings: "Destiny ordained that I should be the first decent human being. . . . I am by far the most terrible man that ever existed. . . . I am the first immoralist." After such quotations as these does any reader of this notice now think that our words were unfair when we began by calling this a book from Bedlam? Yet eighteen volumes of this madman's ravings are in print! A curiosity of literature they are, but surely not to be taken seriously by sane people. The most ingenious and audacious blasphemies ever printed are his. "Ecce Homo" (Behold the Man!) cried Pilate; and the Man was the Founder of a divine Kingdom which will know no end. "Ecce Homo," cries this pitiable and hideous book in its title; and the man is poor, mad, bedeviled Friedrich Nietzsche, raving through thousands of pages, "full of sound and fury signifying nothing," while, as Chesterton says, Christianity sits amid the centuries, guarding the health and sanity of the human race.



*The Wingless Hour.* By RICHARD J. COOKE. 16mo, pp. 203. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. New York: Eaton & Mains. Price, cloth, 50 cents, net; leather, \$1, net.

THIS little book of six chapters on as many themes seems to us the most charming product of Dr. Cooke's prolific pen. Its sweetness and beauty and wisdom are fit to go abroad like a fragrance over the world. The author explains the book's title thus: "During the day while absorbed in work we take no note of the flight of time. The busy hours, like flying birds, pass over our heads, and we observe them not. They are Winged Hours. But when the day's work is done and one is away from home and alone, the hours drag heavily; not with light wing do they come and go, but with feet of lead. These are the Wingless Hours." Born in such hours these chapters seem to have been; meant and fitted for such hours they surely are. The book shows us how, "In quiet moments, when the soul is shut in from the sights and sounds of the garish day, it may strengthen its waning powers in meditation or hold high converse with the real kings of men, and find itself 'never so little alone as when alone.'" The chapters "are not sermons, they are not essays; they are the collected dreamings of the Wingless Hour." They are fit to beguile an idle hour for all thoughtful souls who, amid the carking cares of life, care to live in the spirit. If we were naming the book we would entitle it "Winged Thoughts for Wingless Hours." The subjects of these six meditations are: "The Leakage of Power," "The Fight of the Soul," "The Lure of the Quiet," "The Love that Abides," "The Empty Crib," "The Longing for Home." To strengthen, warn, sweeten, and console is the aim and effect of the book, which is rich with significant historical and literary allusions, choice poetry, vital and illuminating incidents, deep pathos and high vision. One of the tenderest of all the enriching treasures in the book is this sacred outpouring of heart by Dr. Joseph Parker, of London, over the loss of his baby: "Amid all the whirl and dizziness of life's tragedy, in which creation seems to be but one great cloud, I find myself suddenly brought to a sweet baby's grave. A gray old church, a gurgling stream, a far-spreading thorn tree on a green hillock, and a grave on the sunny southerly side. That is it. Thither I hasten night and day, and in patting the soft grass I feel as if conveying some sense of love to the little sleeper far down. Do not reason with me about it; let the wild heart, in its sweet delirium of love, have all its own way. Baby was but two years old when, like a dewdrop, he went up to the warm sun, yet he left my heart as I have seen ground left out of which a storm had torn a great tree. We talk about the influence of great thinkers, great speakers, and great writers; but what about the little infant's power? O, child of my heart, no poet has been so poetical, no soldier so victorious, no benefactor so kind, as thy tiny, unconscious self. I feel thy soft kiss on my withered lips just now, and would give all I have for one look of thy dreamy eyes. But I cannot have it. Yet God is love. Not dark doubt, not staggering argument, not subtle sophism, but child-death, especially where there is but one, makes me wonder and makes me cry in pain. Baby! baby! I could begin the world again without a loaf or a friend if I had but thee; such



a beginning, with all its hardships, would be welcome misery. I do not wonder that the grass is green and soft that covers that little grave, and that the summer birds sing their tenderest notes as they sit on the branches of that old hawthorn tree. My God! Father of mine, in the blue heaven, is not this the heaviest cross that can crush the weakness of man? Yet that green grave, not three feet long, is to me a great estate, making me rich, with wealth untold. I can pray there. There I meet the infant angels; there I see all the mothers whose spirits are above; and there my heart says strange things in strange words—Baby, I am coming, coming soon! Do you know me? Do you see me? Do you look from sunny places down to this cold land of weariness? O, baby; sweet, sweet baby, I will try for your sake to be a better man; I will be kind to other little babies and tell them your name, and sometimes let them play with your toys; but, O, baby, baby, my old heart sobs and breaks!" On this Dr. Cooke comments: "Now, Religion has no conflict with tears. This would be a poor world were there no pain in it. It is sometimes better to go to a funeral than to a banquet. There we touch Realities; at the festal board we may be playing with Illusions. Through tears we see deeper into the meaning of things about us, and farther into the mysteries of the heavens above us."

*Faith and Psychology.* By WILLIAM RALPH INGE. 12mo, pp. x, 248. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, cloth, 75 cents, net.

THIS volume is in the excellent series of "Studies in Theology," edited by the late Principal A. M. Fairbairn, whose name is a synonym for profound theological scholarship. Among the other books published in this series mention may be made of *Revelation and Inspiration*, by Professor James Orr, which is a positive presentation of the authority of the Bible in the light of modern criticism; another volume is *A Critical Introduction to the New Testament*, by Professor Arthur S. Peake, of the Primitive Methodist College, Manchester, who is a sane guide into the realms of New Testament scholarship. A noteworthy feature is the select bibliography which is attached to each volume in this series. Dr. Inge is favorably known as the author of the *Bampton Lectures on Christian Mysticism*, which is one of the standard works on this subject, and is indispensable to the student of the spiritual life. His volume on faith does not deal with dogma, but with life in its full response to the divine appeal. The purpose of the author may best be stated in his own words: "Firstly, to vindicate for religious faith its true dignity as a normal and healthy part of human nature. Next, to insist that faith demands the actual reality of its objects, and can never be content with a God who is only an ideal. Lastly, to show in detail how most of the errors and defects in religious belief have been due to a tendency to arrest the development of faith prematurely, by annexing it to some one faculty to the exclusion of others, or by resting on given authority." Surely a more important service cannot be rendered, and Dr. Inge has done a piece of work which is marked by thorough investigation, clear analysis, keen

criticism, and helpful exposition. The subject of authority as a ground of faith is discussed in three chapters. If by authority is meant the appeal of mature experience, we can understand the significance of these sentences: "The average Christian possesses, in the tenets of his church, a much richer faith than he could have found for himself, a much more complete scheme of beliefs than individually he has any right to call his own." This, of course, does not imply that the average Christian must accept his creeds without the exercise of intelligence and the appeal to experience; nor does it mean that growth in Christian conceptions of truth is disallowed. These matters are carefully considered in the chapters on faith as an act of will, faith based on practical needs, faith and reason. The biblical conception of faith as intellectual conviction and moral self-surrender, and the varying uses of this religious term in the church, are also discussed. The same mystic is heard in the words: "Divine guidance is given us; but the degree of it is determined by our spiritual and mental condition, and it is not communicated in a magical manner so as to save us the trouble of further inquiry." Many religious vagaries might have been avoided had this principle been observed. The primary ground of authority for the Christian is the indwelling Christ. We must, however, guard against that type of spiritual idealism which would separate the Jesus of history from the Christ of faith. The confession of the New Testament and the testimony of the church during the centuries are against this form of error; and this is well set forth in the chapter entitled Authority Based on Jesus Christ. The author's grasp of philosophy and theology, not merely as intellectual disciplines but in their practical bearings on life, has enabled him to realize how serious is the modern perplexity. "Already the crucial question is, not whether Europe shall be Catholic or Protestant, but whether Christianity can come to terms with the awakening self-consciousness of modern civilization, equipped with a vast mass of new scientific knowledge, and animated for the first time by ideals which are not borrowed from classical and Hebrew antiquity." This issue is no less pressing among us, and as a help toward interpretation this volume by Dr. Inge is to be welcomed.

---

#### HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY

*Constitutional and Parliamentary History of the Methodist Episcopal Church.* By JAMES M. BUCKLEY. 8vo, pp. 414. New York: Eaton & Mains. Cincinnati: Jennings & Graham. Price, cloth, \$1.75, net.

VIRTUALLY the result of a lifetime of assiduous and able study is here bestowed upon the present and future generations by one of the master minds of Methodist history. For all who now or hereafter wish to find in a single volume a complete explanation of the organization and methods of the most powerful of Protestant denominations, this book is indispensable. The press, the legal profession, historians, and all others

who desire to obtain an understanding of our system and economy, from an authoritative source, will find it here set forth with the correctness, plainness, lucidity, and orderliness befitting so important an account and exposition. This volume contains a clear and thorough exposition of the Constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church as it was and as it now is. The reader who shall study it with the reliant belief that it is trustworthy, accurate, and authoritative, will not so believe without strong warrant, since no other living man has anything like the author's training and capacity for such a work—the product of fifty years of the continuous application of extraordinary abilities to a congenial and familiar task. Through twenty years we have heard men querying which one of the various services of Dr. Buckley's busy, versatile, influential, and amazingly productive life would finally be regarded as most monumental and memorable. Without assuming to decide that question, we record unhesitatingly our belief that this Constitutional and Parliamentary History of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which can never be overlooked or disused, is so eminent and valuable a service that this book alone is enough to write his name distinctly and lastingly into indestructible history as one of the eminent authorities of American Methodism. We avail ourselves of the following concise outline of the contents of Dr. Buckley's book: "The work is constructed by the following method: It shows what the Church was before it possessed a written Constitution; how that Constitution was made and on what plan it has been modified; how the modifications were effected; and how the Constitution itself has worked. Also it records not only the labors and methods of the majority, but the reasonings of the minority. It consists of fifty chapters. The first five chapters begin with John Wesley and end with the ordination of Francis Asbury. The next division consists of ten chapters, describing a Church in the making, the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, its initial years, a hazardous experiment, the first regular General Conference, the defeat and secession of James O'Kelly, the Conference of 1796, and the great General Conferences of 1800 and 1804; the demand for equitable methods of legislation; and the last non-delegated General Conference. The next department consists of three chapters on the creation of the written Constitution, in which radical differences between the Constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church and that of the United States are shown. Then comes the interpretation of the separate parts of the Constitution, which includes the six Restrictive Rules and the proviso for the change of Restrictive Rules. Six chapters are devoted to the Third Restrictive Rule, covering the duties, the prerogatives, and the restrictions of the Episcopacy. The next department is devoted exclusively to the separation of Canadian Methodism from the Methodist Episcopal Church. The five chapters which follow discuss the bisection of the Church in 1844 and 1845. Four chapters are devoted to Lay Delegation, and one to the revision of the Constitution in the General Conference of 1900 and the following quadrennium. Four chapters, also, describe the principal *unsuccessful attempts to change the Constitution*. Two of these relate to the 'presiding eldership'; the third is the proposed

*veto power for bishops*; and the fourth, bishops for races and languages. The remaining six are devoted to parliamentary history, rational rules and their rational use, the virtue of debate, and a comparison of the relative qualifications of all the deceased bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church." The extent of the circulation of this most important book among both ministry and laity will be a fair measure of the intelligence and mental activity of our church and of the prevalence among us of a desire to be instructed concerning our own denomination, to know its construction and history; in a word, to be well-informed Methodist Episcopalians, not ignorant of the style and structure of the great ecclesiastical house in which we live. If an order should be issued that no man shall be a member of a General Conference who has not passed a fair examination on the contents of this book, we would be treating candidates for admission to that Conference as we treat the candidates for admission to the Annual Conference in requiring them to pass examination on the things they must know in order to be intelligent and profitable servants of the church in the body they are entering. If any who see the notice of this book are led by its title or subject to presuppose it dry and uninteresting to the ordinary reader, they will err. The book itself, if they have enough good sense to buy it and enough intellectual ambition, and, we will add, enough denominational loyalty, to read it—the book itself will quickly dismiss all such presuppositions, for it is alive with stirring and momentous events, impressive with the presence of powerful and influential persons, well-nigh all the great leaders who have molded and moved American Methodism from the beginning until now; unfolding principles and memorable personalities in full play upon the stage of history. The book is in the style of the most dignified historic writings, deliberate, dispassionate, judicial, impersonal. The first personal pronoun is notable for its absence. Events and actors, the constitution and laws and principles, are seen founding and building a great church and making history, but the personality of the author of this book nowhere definitely appears in its pages. The actors have the stage, the stage manager who presents the great drama, and who has been in his day a large participant in shaping history, is invisible. Just after the publication of a certain famous book, Colonel Forney met Senator Charles Sumner and asked him if he had read that wonderful work. "No, sir, I have not," answered Sumner. "Then, sir," continued the Colonel, "I consider that you owe me two hundred and fifty dollars for recommending to you its immediate perusal." Not long afterward, when Forney, meeting Sumner, inquired, "Well, have you read that book?" the Senator replied, "Yes, and *annotated* it." That story may aptly close this brief book notice. If every man who, prompted by this notice, gets two hundred and fifty dollars' worth out of Dr. Buckley's book should send us that amount, we would have a much-needed fund for sending the Methodist Review free to a host of missionaries in home and foreign fields who greatly desire it but have not money enough to pay even its low subscription price. Many of the lay delegates in the General Conference could get that amount of value out of this book and could afford to give as much to the missionaries.

*The House of Harper.* By J. HENRY HARPER. 8vo, pp. 690. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, with 16 portraits, \$3, net.

THE Harper brothers, sons of a Long Island carpenter, were James, John, Joseph Wesley, and Fletcher. From a humble beginning they built up a great and world-famous publishing house which after an honorable century continues to flourish in Franklin Square with characteristic stability, resisting the currents which have taken all other publishing houses uptown. Harper & Brothers have made every department of literature their own, from spelling-books to encyclopædias, from "cheap libraries" to editions de luxe, from Bibles to fashionplates; and the House of Harper has become "one of the institutions of America, a representative example of what honorable purpose, sturdy integrity, inflexible courage, and hard work coupled with high ideals may accomplish in less than a century." The emblem of the House which appears on all its publications is the lighted torch. It burns aloft with undiminished flame, enlightening successive generations with good literature in continuance of the sagacity, the pure principles, and the benevolence of the founders of the House. A very remarkable quartette were the original Harpers, the "Brothers Cheeryble," as they were called, who named their firm "Harper & Brothers." When a gentleman asked James, the oldest of the four, "Which of you is the Harper and which are the Brothers?" the reply was, "Either one is the Harper and the rest are the Brothers." Their ancestor emigrated to this country from England prior to the Revolution. He and his descendants were no small part of the strength of early Methodism in and around New York. Father Harper's strength of character appears in this incident. When he remonstrated with a neighbor against his liquor-drinking, the man said: "Neighbor Harper, you *don't like* the taste of liquor; but you are as much a slave to tobacco as I am to rum, and you can't quit smoking any more than I can quit drinking." Father Harper determined to take that excuse away from his neighbor, and from that day to the end of his life, thirty years after, he never used tobacco. The four Harper brothers were brought up strictly in the good old Methodist way, a way which made clean, conscientious, cheerful, and manly men with sound minds in sound bodies. A truly noble and inspiring story this book tells of the founding and upbuilding of one of the greatest of publishing houses, a House renowned throughout the civilized world as a mighty agency for the enlightening and uplifting of the human race, pouring out a flood of pure and wholesome literature in books and periodicals for a century. This very notable book renders a public service of manifold and lasting value. It is interesting reading for all ages, but for boys and young men it is stimulating and profitable beyond words, as a story of honorable and monumental success. Especially is it a book for Methodist homes. The Harpers all rejoiced in being Methodists. James was elected Mayor of New York city in 1844, partly because he was a Protestant and a conspicuous Methodist. The contest was against the Papists, because of their hostility to the public schools. Bishop Hughes and his Irish Romanists were demanding the expulsion of the Bible from the public schools. The House of Harper was then publishing the handsomest edition of the



Bible ever up to that time issued from an American press. Whigs and Democrats agreed to put aside party politics and unite against the common enemy. They made James Harper mayor and his election was spoken of in the newspapers as "the sublime triumph of the Bible" over its Romish enemies. The writer of this large book, grandson of one of the original firm, stresses the sane and stanch religiousness of the founders of the House of Harper; and the fourth chapter dwells upon the part Methodism had in making them the sturdy and high-bred men they were. The author says: "In ruminating over the reasons why the Harper brothers became the good men they were, I find that much importance must be attached to the influence of Methodism, and still more to the impress of Methodist preachers. The work of the Methodists in various parts of this country during the first fifty years of the nineteenth century was a powerful influence in shaping the character of the nation. When Methodism began to spread in America, converts rapidly multiplied under the missionaries sent out by Wesley, and the call for preachers was greater than the supply. Almost any one who earnestly desired to enlist was accepted. These hardy men were inspired workers who penetrated every State and Territory of the land, enduring the hardest fare, sleeping in the woods, often ridiculed, and sometimes stoned and beaten by the motley crews that composed their congregations. Yet they were successful in thousands of conversions. Following the tide of emigration westward, their plain speech kept the religious sentiment alive, and thus laid a sure foundation for civil government. It is illustrative of the vital power of the gospel that its elementary truths, earnestly delivered by men who had but little educational equipment and refinement, led the worst classes of society from dissolute to moral and orderly habits of life. Poor as these men were, they were yet, according to their means, the munificent patrons of learning; and by their gifts and energy many schools and colleges were established. Not a few of these missionaries became themselves admirable scholars. It is safe to say that Francis Asbury wrought as deeply into our national life, socially, morally, religiously, and, by consequence, politically, as any statesman who acted a part in the really formative period of our nation—that period, I mean, which is marked by the building up of society in the valley of the Mississippi. It is not too much to say that if the great West sprang at once into civilization without passing through the intermediate stage of semibarbarism, it was due, more than to any other cause, to the Methodist preachers of the day. They laid hold on the growth of humanity springing up so luxuriantly in that rich field and engrafted upon it the scions of civilization, culture, and religion. For forty-five years, ending with his death in 1816, Asbury was the presiding genius of Methodism in this country. Of the Methodist preachers trained in the school of Asbury, not a few became men of note, some of them fair scholars in the accepted meaning of that word, and some grew to be scholars in a far higher sense. Two books they knew well, the Bible and the Hymns of Charles Wesley. One day they were the guests of those of high culture, the next, perhaps, they put up in the lowliest cabins of the settlers. By virtue of their sacred functions, before which all human dis-



tinctions disappeared, they were the equals of every man whom they met. The highest were not above them, the lowest not beneath. They were, in that noble sense meant by the great apostle, 'all things to all men,' and with a view that they might thereby 'win some' to a life of holiness and virtue. Not a few of these preachers became famous orators. Perhaps no training for an orator—that is, one who by word of mouth is able to move men's hearts—is equal to that of the Methodist preacher a century ago. At early morning he mounted his horse and set out for the next station, perhaps twenty miles away, and it was likely that for hours there would not be a human being within sound of his voice. He takes out from his saddlebag a pocket Bible and reads aloud a psalm, repeating it until the sound comes back to his ear as the exponent of the import of the passage. If he has a feeling for music, as most such men had, he sings over and over again one of Charles Wesley's glorious hymns. Then, for his sermon, not a word of which has been written, although he knows it all by heart, as he has recited it many times to himself—he now rehearses it, adding here and there a phrase, here and there leaving out another, trying every modulation and inflection of voice, and so by repeated revision and correction making it by mode of expression and manner of delivery as nearly perfect as lay in his power. Discourses as complete in conception and perfect in delivery as man ever heard have been listened to originally by a few score of people in some log-house on a Methodist circuit. It is no wonder that when some Methodist pioneer preacher had an opportunity of delivering such a sermon before a great city audience he should electrify the assembly. It is said that on hearing a sermon so prepared, Henry Clay declared that Henry B. Bascom, an itinerant preacher who never set foot in college or ever heard a lecture on rhetoric, was the most eloquent speaker he had ever heard. Such men had much to do with the early training of the Harper brothers. When boys, their father's house had been—as had been their father's father's before him—a preachers' home. Francis Asbury, Bishop Hedding, and a long list of Methodist worthies were no strangers in their father's domicile. These noble men exerted a lasting influence on the Harper boys and taught them much of that courtesy of manner which marked them through life. Notwithstanding their many hardships, the early Methodist preachers were notable as a cheerful, if not indeed a humorous, class of men. Their hopeful theology, their continued success, their unconscious self-sacrifice for the good of others, the great variety of characters they met in their travels, and their habit of self-accommodation to all, gave them an ease, a *bonhomie* which often took the form of genial humor; and the occasional morbid minds among them could hardly resist the infectious example of their happier brethren. While they were as earnest as men about to face death, and full of the tenderness which could 'weep with those who weep,' no men could better 'rejoice with those who rejoiced.' Not a few of them became noted as wits, in the best sense of the term, and were by their repartees, as well as by their courage and religious earnestness, a terror to evil-doers. The gatherings at my grandfather's Monday dinners, which were a feature in his city home during my boyhood, were made up of just such men."

Surely it cannot seem to any one bad taste for us, noticing this book in the *METHODIST REVIEW*, to quote some of the author's references to Methodism and the part it had in making the founders of the House of Harper the strong and noble men they were. Wesley Harper was the firm's correspondent, and the author says: "His letters, embracing a wide variety of subjects and addressed to persons of every kind of temperament, were remarkable for the same urbanity of manner and intelligent clearness of statement that marked his personal intercourse. He thanked God that he was a Methodist; but there was probably never a man so affectionately and firmly attached to his own religious denomination who was so truly liberal and free from all taint of bigotry. He held to his own sect, but as one believing that in his Father's house were many mansions. Sectarian arrogance was as impossible to him as social arrogance. If you watched him on Sunday, you saw that he went to the Methodist church. If you watched him every day in the year, you saw that he was a good man. The impression made by him upon all who came to the office was that of an intelligent, courteous, and most unassuming man. Although of the utmost politeness and manly gentleness, he was a man of clear insight into character, and curiously impatient of pretense." George William Curtis, a Unitarian, wrote of one of the Harper brothers thus: "He was the most simple and manly of men in his friendly intercourse, his conversation touching every topic with a gay and sometimes half-grim humor. As Napoleon was said to have the power, when he was inconveniently pressed in an interview, of discharging his face of all expression, Fletcher Harper had a shrewd way, when he was suddenly flanked in a colloquy by a moral suggestion, of saying, 'Of course, if you come to metaphysics, I can't follow you.' With his hearty, generous nature, he had the Homeric joy of battle. He 'enjoyed an honest fight' within all honorable limitations. He was unswervingly faithful to his friends and his convictions, his first question about a man being, 'Is he honest?' and about conduct, 'Is it right?' and about an assertion, 'Is it true?' Mr. Harper had those other characteristic qualities of a master mind—patience and reticence. He could wait and he could keep silent. He did not pull up his plants to see if they were growing, nor stop his watch to find if it were in order. His sagacity assured him that the laws of nature and of mechanics could be implicitly trusted. Consequently, when he confided great responsibility he did not interfere with its exercise. He made no trust without due discretion and deliberation, but when made it was complete and conclusive. During his active career he was constantly mindful of Harper's Weekly, devising changes and improvements and fresh attractions, anxious above all that it should be popular in a high and generous sense. His test of the excellence of a picture or an article was that it told its own story clearly and did not require to be explained. But every line in print or picture must be proper for family reading and inspection. There might be questions of taste, but there must be none of morals. There must be no doubtful words or allusions, no double meanings. He had in view 'the people,' 'the plain people,' and not philosophers and poets; and it is the praise of the House of Harper that all the books and periodicals it has

issued for half a century constitute together what the House felicitously called one of its earliest and most famous series, a true Family Library. The end came amid the splendor of the early summer, whose delights he had been gladly anticipating; but death did not surprise him from the serenity of his self-possession. When he knew that death was at hand, although the enjoyment of life was still strong and high, he acquiesced calmly, speaking in the words and after the manner of the fervent Methodist faith in which he had been carefully trained and to which he had always faithfully adhered. He rests in one of the sunniest sites in Greenwood, and in a family tomb raised for the four brothers Harper by their descendants. In his last sickness he was heard to say, when half unconscious, 'Side by side! Isn't it wonderful? Side by side!' Side by side the four memorable brothers rest, united in life and death. Hushed are their pleasant jests, their fraternal railleries, their perpetual gaiety, their merry laugh. But they had lived in charity and died in hope. No man had stronger religious convictions than Fletcher Harper, and a golden future dawned upon him as he left the world." The following letter from Gilbert Haven and J. W. Harper's reply explain themselves: "New Orleans, January 10, 1876. MY DEAR MR. HARPER—In a professed 'interview' with me, published in the Omaha Bee, I am reported as saying, 'The Harpers don't care, as long as they can make money, notwithstanding they are Methodists.' I never made any such remark, nor thought it. I had a conversation upon Church matters, local and personal, with a brother there, and did add a few words on public questions. But in no part of my conversation did I refer to your House in the manner asserted. Nothing in the subject-matter of that conversation has troubled me except the 'interview,' falsely so called, and that which chiefly troubled me in that article was this reference to your House, unjust and untrue to you, and entirely foreign to all my thought and feeling. I beg you not to believe that I could have uttered that remark. I am most truly yours, G. HAVEN." "DEAR BISHOP HAVEN—I was glad to receive your disclaimer, which will be published in the Weekly: I. In justice to my father and uncles, who were good Methodists and most honorable gentlemen, not only above the sordid and mercenary considerations imputed to them by your interviewing acquaintance, but as absolutely free as any men I ever knew of even the desire of accumulation. II. In justice to the character of Methodist Bishops, whom from my boyhood I have honored and respected as desirous of good work and blameless, and too good and wise to be capable of slander. III. In justice to your own reputation, because you cannot afford to stand before your brethren and the world as a public assailant of private character. And now, my dear Bishop, as you are a young man, I venture to remind you of your vow in the solemn ordination office, 'to maintain and set forward, as much as shall lie in you, quietness, love, and peace among all men'—and I advise you, above all, to cultivate, even toward my friend Mr. Curtis and others who may differ from you in opinion, 'that most excellent gift of charity, the very bond of peace and of all virtues.' Remember, that though you may 'speak with the tongues of men and angels, and have not charity, you are become as sounding

brass or a tinkling cymbal.'" Harper & Brothers published Dr. William Arthur's great and remarkably successful book, *The Tongue of Fire*. When Dr. Arthur heard that his publishers had suffered in the general financial crash of 1857, he wrote Fletcher Harper as follows: "When I wrote last, requesting my balance, I had no idea of this money panic. I know few who can worse afford to lose than I; for this year I have no salary; but I cheerfully take my lot, whatever it may prove; and only feel for the inconvenience and mortification which you must all suffer. These events touch none of us by accident; our Heavenly Father appoints them wisely and well, and I earnestly pray both that He may support and comfort you all, and make them turn to good!" Lest our copious quotations from the references to Methodists and Methodism produce the impression that this is a Methodist book, we make haste to say as emphatically as possible that it is not. Though its founders were Methodists, the House of Harper was never a Methodist house. It was and is so much a national institution that its financial failure a few years ago (from which it has now recovered) was spoken of by a leading Episcopal layman as "a national calamity." Harper & Brothers have been the publishers for a long list of the most famous authors of the English-speaking world of England and America. This book is so crowded with incidents and anecdotes about them that it is almost a world-book. Among them are George Elliot, Wilkie Collins, Lew Wallace, Mark Twain, William Black, George William Curtis, Charles Dickens, Thomas Hardy, and a host of others like them. The Harpers paid Longfellow one thousand dollars for each of his two poems, "Morituri Salutamus" and "Keramos."

The author gives this about Lew Wallace: "When General Wallace first brought his manuscript to Franklin Square he laid it on my desk and told me that it was a tale of the time when Christ appeared on earth. I asked him if our Saviour figured as a character in the story, and he replied, 'Yes.' I intimated to him that this was of necessity a very delicate situation to handle, and he agreed with me, and assured me that he would rather lose his right hand than publish anything that would offend a genuine Christian. 'If it actually has that tendency, I must know it, and I should then promptly suppress the work,' he said. General Wallace gave me an interesting account of the origin, or *raison d'être*, of *Ben-Hur*. He said that one day on a railroad trip he happened to be seated near Colonel Ingersoll and their conversation turned to the question of the divinity of Christ. Ingersoll, like most skeptics or agnostics, possessed an unsettled mind as to the future state, and he was ever inclined to obtrude his views as to religious matters on chance acquaintances. The General was much impressed by what Ingersoll had to say, for no matter what he thought of Ingersoll from an orthodox point of view, he was a most eloquent pleader. Wallace told Ingersoll he was not willing to follow him as far as the non-divinity of Christ was concerned, but that he was disposed to give the question serious study. After leaving Ingersoll he ran over in his mind the best way to arrive at a satisfactory solution. He agreed with Ingersoll that it might be unconvincing to turn to accepted authorities or to confer with the clergy or any

Christian doctrinaires who might be unduly prejudiced, so he decided to write a history of Christ which would enable him to examine the pros and cons of both sides. For six years he worked assiduously on his task until he finally produced *Ben-Hur*. General Wallace wound up his story with the trenchant statement that the result of his labors was the absolute conviction that Jesus of Nazareth was not only a Christ and the Christ, but that He was also his Christ, his Saviour, and his Redeemer."

Charles Reade was one of the most intrepid, vigorous, and popular of English writers, one of the last of the great age of Dickens and Thackeray. The Harpers were his publishers. He wrote his own epitaph which is significant enough to justify lengthening this book notice with it: "Here lie, by the Side of his Beloved Friend, the Mortal Remains of CHARLES READE, Dramatist, Novelist, and Journalist. His last Words to Mankind are on this Stone. I hope for a resurrection, not from any power in nature, but from the will of the Lord God Omnipotent, who made nature and me. He created man out of nothing, which nature could not. And I hope for holiness and happiness in a future life, not for anything I have said or done in this body, but from the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ. He has promised His intercession to all who seek it, and He will not break His word; that intercession once granted, cannot be rejected; for He is God, and His merits infinite. 'Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.' 'If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins.'" A momentous and monumental work is this story of *The House of Harper*, fully worthy of the space we have given it.

*Charles Darwin and Other English Thinkers.* By S. PARKES CADMAN. 12mo, pp. 284. Boston, New York, and Chicago: The Pilgrim Press. Price, cloth, \$1.25, net.

A SERIES of lectures under the auspices of that admirable agency for public education and culture, the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences. The "other English thinkers" discussed herein are Huxley, Stuart Mill, Martineau, and Matthew Arnold. The particular aim is to estimate the religious and ethical value of each of these five men. The lecturer is not unknown to Methodism nor to evangelical Christendom in England and America. His mother, Methodism, has loaned him for a while to a congregation which, in desiring and welcoming him, without change of doctrine or spirit on his part, confessed itself not un-Methodistic, and which becomes even less so with every word he utters and every spiritual breath he exhales. Still, as ever, the "puissant hail" of his robust and nervous voice brings the message of an evangelical gospel and sounds its summoning call to the reason and the conscience of mankind. Energy, momentum, and ictus mark the man, and his sermons and addresses make one feel that his ministry should be largely successful in the highest way, since he has the convictions, fervency, and moving force competent for powerful evangelism. He defines the main purpose of these lectures thus: "I am profoundly convinced that science and philosophy and ethics, however they may appear on the surface, are the



friends, and not the foes, of religion. And I believe that a new day has dawned for the Christian Church, in which she can fearlessly and yet reverently utilize their newer conceptions for the enrichment of her message to the generation she seeks to serve. It has not been my aim to write a constructive work along these lines, but simply to place in the most favorable light consistent with accuracy a group of thinkers whose teachings have been sometimes supposed to stand in irreconcilable contradiction to the essential truths of Christianity." To this end Dr. Cadman's affluence of thought and fluency of diction are poured out in the volume before us. His dealing with his five "English thinkers" is intelligent and entirely fair, recognizing their excellences, values, and services, while pointing out their errors, limitations, and defects. Huxley's single-minded consecration to what he conceived to be his mission is given in his own words thus: "I have finally decided that my vocation is science, and I have made up my mind to the comparative poverty which is its necessary adjunct, and to the no less certain seclusion from the ordinary pleasures and rewards of men," words which show a sacrificial temper worthy of a man entering upon the work of the Christian ministry. And in the following words we hear Huxley's independence and sincerity as he settles to his career: "There are many nice people in this world, for whose praise or blame I care not a whistle. I don't know, and I don't care, whether I shall ever be what is called a great man. I will leave my mark somewhere, and it shall be clear and distinct [T. H. H., his mark], and free from the abominable blur of cant, humbug, and self-seeking which surrounds everything in this present world—that is to say, supposing that I am not already unconsciously tainted myself, a result of which I have a morbid dread." When our lecturer tells us how Huxley, after watching intently the tug-boats tearing up and down New York Harbor, said: "If I were not a man I think I should like to be a tug," we find ourselves, next day, unable to remember whether it was Huxley or Cadman who expressed that feeling—and there is not difference enough in the temper of the two men to give us a clue to guess by. Huxley noticed as deplorably as Dr. Cadman could that "Men of ability are common enough, but men of character and conviction are very rare"; and Huxley would agree that men of ability without character are, in proportion to their ability, an awful menace and curse to the world. For a sample of our lecturer's own style, take this passage from his discussion of John Stuart Mill: "In the nineteenth century the stream of reforming thought was swollen by three great currents which flowed into it. These were the ethical, the metaphysical, and the scientific. They arose at different times; and in Germany and France, as well as in Britain and America, they gave an almost unprecedented significance to the era in which they found their confluence. The first began in Sensationalism, eddied in Utilitarianism, and was swept forward by the pressure of new truths the other two contained. James Mill and his son gave ethical Utilitarianism its authoritative form; but, despite this, it steadily dwindled, and, after the death of John Stuart, ceased to be a large factor in individual or social ethics. The system which re-

garded the world of humanity as an aggregate of detached units, a collection of mere individuals, with nothing in common save their natural sensuous necessities, who repelled each other by their selfish greed, was an offense against the highest instincts of our being and led to naked naturalism. Political economy supplanted ethics, psychology outgeneraled metaphysics, and religion wallowed in the slough of self-desire. Carlyle sturdily rebuked these defections. He testified to the presence of God in the spirit of man, and looked upon this life through the transfiguring light of another and a loftier world. Penetrating the husk of time, he saw that eternity was here and now, 'a tranquil element underlying the heated antagonisms of man's existence.' 'This theory,' he exclaimed, speaking of Utilitarianism, 'should make us go on all fours and lay no claim at all to the dignity of being moral.' Within its confines man had no history as he had no future, no power either of ascent or descent. He was simply a human animal glutted with present demands and the efforts to satisfy them. It presented no ideals which could raise man above his natural selfhood or lead him to sacrifice the lower for the higher. He was pitifully reduced to an object, a *thing* affected by other things as they pained or pleased him, and acting, like any other object, in obedience to motives that had an external origin in the world of sense. These were the maunderings which provoked Carlyle's ire. 'Is the heroic inspiration we name Virtue but some Passion; some bubble of the blood, bubbling in the direction others *profit* by? . . . If what thou namest Happiness be our true aim, then are we all astray. With Stupidity and sound Digestion man may front much. But what, in these dull unimaginative days, are the terrors of Conscience to the diseases of the Liver! Not on Morality, but on Cookery, let us build our stronghold: there brandishing our frying-pan, as censer, let us offer sweet incense to the Devil, and live at ease on the fat things *he* has provided for his Elect!'" Commenting on Mill's oft-quoted dilemma: "Either God could have prevented evil, and would not; or He would have prevented evil, and could not. If I accept the first, I conclude He is not all-good. If I accept the second, then He is not all-powerful." Dr. Cadman says: "The possibilities of God, however, cannot be compressed into a dilemma. Mill's reasoning about the goodness and power of God and his insistence on choosing an alternative are fallacious. It is easy to formulate a proposition that appears conclusive; but a syllogism may be formally correct, and still be actually wrong. Why cannot God be all-powerful and yet allow evil a place in the divine scheme? That is a supposition which Mill did not even admit here, though he allowed it in a letter written to a friend in 1860, to whom he says, 'It would be a great moral improvement to most persons, be they Christian, Deists, or atheists, if they firmly believed the world to be under the government of a Being who, willing only good, leaves evil in the world solely in order to stimulate human faculties by an unremitting struggle against every form of it.'" One of the best of Dr. Cadman's discussions is that on James Martineau, who was one of the loveliest figures seen in the Christian pulpit, a man who in his best hours and utterances

was genuinely evangelical in spirit. Here is A. W. Jackson's description of him as he appeared in London: "A tall, spare figure robed in the scholar's gown, and wearing the dignities of his office as a natural grace; a thin face, suggestive of the cloister, and traced with deep lines of thought; a voice not loud, but musical and reaching; an enunciation leisurely but not slow, and perfectly distinct. . . . And now the sermon; from the beginning it is plain that it is to serious thought, yes, and hard thinking, that you are invited. . . . Dr. Martineau as a preacher never entertains; he has serious business with you, and to the consideration of that he holds you with little thought whether he entertains or not. You have been living in some castle of worldliness or pride; there is a hopeless debris around you, and you a shivering and unsheltered soul in the bleak desert of the world. You were suffocated with the dust of life; you are borne away to some Alpine summit where the air is free and a glory thrills you. You came hither, as you felt, deserted and one; you go home with—God." Listen to Martineau, the Unitarian, disparaging the products of Unitarianism, and exalting the evangelical hymns: "I am constrained to say that neither my intellectual preference nor any moral admiration goes heartily with the Unitarian heroes, sects, or productions of any age. Ebionites, Arians, Socinians all seem to me to contrast unfavorably with their opponents, and to exhibit a type of thought and character far less worthy, on the whole, of the true genius of Christianity. . . . In devotional literature and religious thought I find nothing of ours that does not pale before Augustine, Tauler, and Pascal. And in the poetry of the Church it is the Latin or the German hymns, or the lines of Charles Wesley or of Keble, that fasten on my memory and heart, and make all else seem poor and cold. . . . To be torn away from the great company I have named, and transferred to the ranks which command a far fainter allegiance, is an unnatural and for me an inadmissible fate. . . . For myself both conviction and feeling keep me close to the poetry and plety of Christendom. It is my native air, and in no other can I breathe; and wherever it passes, it so mellows the soil and feeds the roots of character, and nurtures such grace and balance of affection, that for any climate similarly rich in elements of perfect life I look in vain elsewhere." Dr. Cadman goes on: "Martineau looked upon experience as the true test of religion and its legitimate sphere of verification. And experience meant for him a genuine sense of present spiritual union and reality springing from individual surrender to God. His definition of this is not unlike the evangelical doctrine of conversion; it implies an awakening which results in the consecration of life and all its powers. 'The moment of its new birth is the discovery that your gleaming is the everlasting real: no transparent brush of a fancied angel's wing, but the abiding presence and persuasion of the soul of souls.' It was this emphasis on experience which led him to say that the Methodists, above all others, ought to show a ready adaptability to the changes in modern thought on account of the faith they reposed in their consciousness of the Divine Presence. When the highest we know becomes more than ideal; when men are so vitally

brought into contact with it that they appropriate it as a part of themselves, they unite their lives with the very life of God, and are a part of that historic sainthood which has done his work in the world. This truth and its meaning for those who accept and use it has a noble expression in Martineau's parting injunction to the Liverpool congregation. His whole word and work among them, he avowed, had been determined by his deep faith in 'the living union of God with humanity.' He had endeavored to convince his people that God is in direct touch with human souls, communes with their spirits, and listens to their prayers. He is a God that is not only far off, but here; he can be seen and met on earth. He is not only in the 'flashing scorn' and 'bursting frown of thunder,' but he speaks to each waiting soul in his still small voice. 'Here is the dear and mighty God at home. . . . Day by day, from morn to night, under our rooftree and out upon the fields, in the mind that thinks, in the heart that aspires, in the nation that strives for the right, in the world that moves on its course, he lives with us, and manifests himself through us, with every variety of good.' Nor were such sentiments confined to his sermons and addresses; they permeate all his works, and especially the great chapter on 'Natural and Revealed Religion' contained in *A Study of Religion*. In this he shows that all the interpretations of naturalistic religion empty the term 'religion' of 'every idea of personal and moral relationship between the human soul and God.' He dwells on these relations continually. But what of sin, death, and the future? How did he regard these? The reply is, with a sternness which no serious preacher could exceed. Mr. R. H. Hutton says that Martineau's sermon on 'Christ's Treatment of Guilt' inspired him with 'the fear of hell.' One passage reads: 'In many a hospital of mental disease you have doubtless seen a melancholy being, pacing to and fro with rapid strides and lost to everything around; wringing his hands in incommunicable suffering, and letting fall a low mutter rising quickly into the shrill cry; his features cut with the graver of sharp anguish; his eyelids drooping and showering ever scalding tears. It is the maniac of remorse. . . . He is the dread type of hell. He is absolutely sequestered, as many minds may be hereafter, incarcerated alone with his memories of objects and unaware of time; and every guilty soul may find itself standing alone in a theater peopled with the collected images of the ills that he has done; and, turn where he may, the features he has made sad with grief, the eyes he has lighted with passion, the infant faces he has suffused with needless tears, stare upon him with insufferable fixedness.' And if thus the past be truly indestructible; if thus its fragments may be regathered; if its details of evil thought and act may be thus brought together and fused into one big agony—it may be left to fools to make a mock of sin. Whatever the liberal theologians have said about sin as merely a mistake, and retribution as an idea culled from the ethics of the nursery, it is clear that he regarded sin as a terrible fact, to be followed by a suffering which the sinner has wholly brought upon himself." If even a Unitarian preaches thus about the heinous nature and frightful consequences of sin, what ought we

to do? We commend this book of Dr. Cadman's to our reading public. Particularly we note that his discussion of Matthew Arnold is one of the best to be found anywhere.

*Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.* Edited by JAMES HASTINGS, M.A., D.D., with the assistance of JOHN A. SELBIE, M.A., D.D. Vol. IV, Confirmation—Drama. Pp. xvi, 907. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912. Price \$7.

ANOTHER thick and portly volume of this splendid work is before us. It is specially to be commended for its full and scholarly treatment of all subjects within its domain. "Crimes and Punishments" has 58 pages, 15 different articles according to different religions and countries. "Creeds and Articles" has 7 articles, 16 pages. "Death and the Disposition of the Dead" has 19 articles, 101 pages. "Demons and Spirits" has 20 articles, 101 pages. "Drama" has 12 articles, 41 pages. The standpoint of the *Encyclopædia* is Christian, as the name of the editor guarantees, but the articles are written from the progressive or scientific point of view. It is thoroughly modern. Strachan on "Criticism: Old Testament," is out and out for the new views, though he unconsciously shows how thoroughly contradictory they are when he says: "While scholars like Baudissin and Kittel hold that the Law of Holiness (Lev. 17. 26) precedes Deuteronomy, and Driver and Ryle that it is later than Deuteronomy, but prior to Ezekiel, Addis has argued very ably for placing it after both these writings." The article by Allen on "Criticism: New Testament," is more objective, and points to a standpoint like that of Peake in his Introduction (1909), "which is anxious neither to affirm nor to deny traditional positions, but only to come to conclusions to which the evidence points, and to keep an open mind where the evidence is inconclusive." There may be prejudice on the radical as on the conservative side, as where Allen speaks of the determination in Germany "to keep Catholic Epistles out of the first century." He refers to the old view that the Fourth Gospel breathed the Alexandrine atmosphere and, therefore, could not belong to John nor to the first century, but that now Harnack admits that outside of the prologue there is nothing essentially Hellenic in that gospel. The Jewish air of the gospel has been further confirmed by the discovery and publication of the Odes and Psalms of Solomon by Harris in 1909, which move in a circle of ideas Jewish and Christian, in which John's Gospel is at home, and which Harris places in the first century. If this is true, Allen says that a "great many arguments for a second century date for the Fourth Gospel, and a large number of objections to the Johannine authorship, cease to have any validity." There is a long and interesting treatment of "Deluge," by Woods. The article on "Decalogue," by Batten, strikes well the middle goal between the radicals and the conservatives. But some of the arguments for the late origin of the commandments seem to this reviewer almost ridiculously inconclusive. Because David's wife Michal had teraphim must we conclude he "defied so fundamental a law" as that against images? (1. Sam. 19. 13). All we would infer is that, if David knew that she had an image, he did not care to have a family quarrel



on the subject, but indulged her weakness. Nor can we argue from Hezekiah's iconoclastic zeal (2 Kings 18. 4), that "image worship was certainly practiced down to the exile without rebuke." Nor does the pillar of Isa. 19. 19 mean that Isalah "countenanced images." Now it may be that the second commandment is not Mosale; only these arguments don't show that it is not. Nor are the points brought forward to prove that the Sabbath commandment is post-Mosaic any more conclusive. They are all too subjective and arbitrary. By the same method you could prove that almost any passage in the Scriptures was not spoken by the man to whom it is referred. On the other hand, Batten makes a fine point in meeting the objection that the tenth commandment is too refined for the period of Moses. "Quite true. But it is not so sure that the refinement was too great for Moses, the man of God. The Decalogue does not profess to be a production showing the moral sentiment of the age, but is the work of the most enlightened man of the time. Among a rude people it is always possible for one to rise head and shoulders above the rest, not only in stature, like Saul, but in moral insight, as Moses certainly did." The author thinks the Decalogue was a growth of centuries, but he admits that the commandments "may all be Mosale except possibly the first, and almost certainly the second." There are two articles on Confirmation, one by Lawlor, from the Anglican point of view, the other by the Jesuit Thurston, both able and informing pieces. There ought to have been another from the Protestant standpoint. All that Lawlor can say is that in the apostolic age a "rite of confirmation was widely, if not universally, used, the main parts of which were prayer and imposition of hands." We suspect that even this statement goes beyond the evidence. Was it a *rite*? Was it *widely* used? The laying on of hands among the Jews and early Christians was a custom, like our handshaking, not a rite, though occasionally also a rite, like our right hand of fellowship. But it can be shown (1) that the gift of the Spirit was given without any reference to either baptism or laying on of hands, (2) that it was sometimes given in baptism, and (3) sometimes with prayer and the laying on of hands. The situation was different, therefore, from that presupposed by the High Church doctrine of confirmation. Again, Christianity being a spiritual religion, it is certain that the Spirit was never given except in response to the faith or spiritual receptivity of the candidate, and that He was *always* given in response to that receptivity. The laying on of hands may or may not have quickened that faith. But the ceremonializing of the laying on of hands into a definite rite of confirmation, with which the gift of the Spirit was bound up, was a Catholic evolution in harmony with certain customs of apostolic times, but contrary to the deeper religious principles of Christianity. There is a fine article on Conversion, by Strachan (misspelled Strahan, in the list of authors, p. xi). He quotes that striking passage on conversion from Froude's Bunyan, about the bloom being gone from the flower, the "most solemn of all realities degraded into the passwords of technical theology," and he adds: "But all that is needed to bring back the bloom to the flower and plumage to the wing is

a new spring time. Human errors and caricatures do not alter divine facts, any more than the mists extinguish the stars. A wide survey of the data of the spiritual life leads to the conclusion that the majority of conversions have little of the picturesque or dramatic in them, that some take place beneath the threshold of consciousness; that others are but dumb yearnings of penitence and faith toward God; that the memorabilia of soul-life are usually very brief, the convert sometimes limiting himself to the wondering exclamation, 'Whereas I was blind, now I see' (John 9. 25). Yet every conversion enfolds in itself a divine secret—the mystery of life—whose power and beauty will gradually be unfolded to the eye, but whose inner significance no mind can penetrate." There are nineteen different articles (55 pages) on "Cosmogony and Cosmology," a rich and attractive feast. Father Thurston's (S. J.) article on Councils (Christian, Modern, pp. 197-203) leaves something to be desired in our judgment in regard to good faith and historic fairness and completeness, but it is always important for a Protestant to get the strict Roman Catholic side. But even Thurston condemns the violation of Hus's safe conduct by the Council of Constance. "No special pleading can palliate this breach of faith." Strachan's interesting article on Creation, while affirming the dependence of all things upon God and the derivation of all things from God, rejects the idea of creation in time or at any definite point in eternity. Creation is an eternal process involved in the very being of God. What do our systematic theology chairs say about that? The author of the article Culdees, T. Jones Parry, is omitted in the list of contributors. Quinton's excellent article on Criminology has some wise remarks on capital punishment, which we commend to all interested. When the death penalty was abolished in Switzerland, murders increased seventy-five per cent in five years. To all earnest students of religion this great encyclopedia is of priceless worth. Its breadth of subjects, exhaustiveness of treatment, and scientific method and accuracy, set it apart by itself among English books. It is a pleasure to read Workman's scholarly articles on Constantine and Crusades.



WIRSCHING ORGAN IN ILIFF SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY  
UNIVERSITY PARK, DENVER, COLORADO

## **The WIRSCHING ORGAN**

### **The Pipe Organ OF INDIVIDUALITY AND EXCELLENCE**

Not a mechanical novelty, but a  
thoroughly reliable and most modern  
organ.

**IN TONE A WORK  
OF ART**

Correspondence Invited

**THE WIRSCHING  
ORGAN COMPANY  
SALEM, OHIO**



## **THOMAS INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION SERVICE**

OF the 20,000 churches using Individual Cups, 12,000 of them are using the **THOMAS SYSTEM**. Why? Our service has features to be found in no others. Trays are noiseless, interlocking, dust-proof; we furnish shallow glass which does not require tipping of head. Special padded tray for altar communion. Instantaneous Filler fills 150 glasses per minute. Trays of aluminum and best quadruple-silver plate. Outfits sent for trial. Collection plates, bread plates, baptismal bowls.

Address,

**THOMAS  
COMMUNION SERVICE CO.**

Box 300

LIMA, OHIO

## **HEADQUARTERS FOR CHURCH SUPPLIES**

Write for description and prices on Hymn Boards, Collection Plates, Individual Communion Services, Duplex Envelopes, etc.

**THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN**  
220 Fourth Avenue, West, Cincinnati, O.